



3 1761 06891375 5

DISSERTATIONS

UPON AN

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.





DISSEMINATION

1908

HARMONY OF THE

Bib. Lit
G

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

DISSERTATIONS

UPON

THE PRINCIPLES

AND

ARRANGEMENT

OF AN

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

BY

EDWARD GRESWELL, B. D.

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

SECOND EDITION,

IN FOUR VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

OXFORD,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXXXVII.

THE CONTENTS

OF THE

SECOND VOLUME.

DISSERTATION XV.

On the prophecy of the Seventy weeks, and the first part of the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles 1—81

Texts of Scripture—The beginning of the Christian dispensation a fixed and determinate point of time—Fulness of the time arrived with our Lord's personal appearance in his ministry—Time of the appearance of the Messiah, matter of prophecy beforehand; and if so, of the prophecy of the Seventy weeks..... 1—5

490 years not the absolute length of time contained in the prophecy of the Seventy weeks; unless as referred to a double ἀρχή—Structure of the prophecy—Particular statements which follow, explanatory of the general premised—Idiom of the modes of speech in expressing whole numbers and a fraction, by the nearest round number—Examples of this mode of speaking among the Jews—Seventy weeks specified in the prophecy in general, but seventy and an half in the details 5—8

Reduction of the four divisions of the weeks to three—Peculiarity of each of the divisions—Messiah the Prince, at the close of the sixty-nine weeks—Messiah the Prince, and the cutting off of Messiah, not synchronous—Emphatic circumstance of the one week, and the half week—Cessation of sacrifice and oblation, at the close of the half week, either literal or figurative—Scope and comprehension of the words *zebach* and *mincha*—Purpose assigned to the one week, in what sense to be explained consistently with the fact—Covenant with Abraham, and covenant with Moses, both made good in the gospel—The ἐκλογὴ among the Jews 8—11

Figurative sense of the purpose of the half week, on what principle alone demonstrable to be the true—Purpose ascribed to the one week, on what principle, in like manner, the true—Resulting con-

clusion, the purpose of the half week, though posterior in the order of statement, is prior in the order of the event, to the purpose of the one week—Cessation of the temple service in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes—Suspension of the daily burnt sacrifice of the emperor Augustus—Actual cessation of the daily sacrifice, U. C. 823—None of these capable of fulfilling the conditions of the prophecy. 12—15

Application of the principles of interpretation laid down, to the matter of fact—Reckoned back from the date of the ministration of the Messiah, the first sixty-nine weeks of the prophecy coincide with the date of the mission of Ezra—Mission of Ezra the only true date of the Seventy weeks—First of Artaxerxes Longimanus—Mission of Ezra bears date in the sixth, and his arrival at Jerusalem, in the seventh of Artaxerxes—Feast of Tabernacles in the year of the appearance of John Baptist, and in that of the arrival of Ezra—Date of the departure of Ezra, and date of his arrival at Jerusalem—Date of the restitution of the *ἐνδελεχισμός*, or temple service, B. C. 536. 15—19

Half-week true of the interval between the beginning and end of the ministration of the Messiah—The one week, or seven years, true of the interval between the commencement of preaching the gospel, and the preaching it to any but Jews—Close of this period, the martyrdom of Stephen, the preaching of the gospel to the Samaritans, and the conversion of St. Paul 18—20

Date of the martyrdom of Stephen, and the conversion in question, according to Hippolytus the Theban—Confirmed by the Recognitiones Clementinæ 20

Inductive proof of the truth of these dates—Sanhedrim of the Jews, from what period no longer possessed of the power of life and death—Cases of the exercise of this power coincident with times when there was no regular governor of Judæa—Death of James the Just a case of this kind—Martyrdom of Stephen another. . 20—22

Time of the removal of Pilate by Vitellius—Presence of Vitellius in Jerusalem—Death of Tiberius, and accession of Caius—Herod Agrippa—Maryllus, the Hipparchus—Favourableness of the juncture for an attack on the Christians, or the commencement of a persecution of Christianity at Jerusalem. 22—24

Answer to the objection, that the period of seven years is too considerable an interval of time for the first seven chapters of the Acts—Hiatuses in the details of these chapters, and places where they occur—Greatest interval of this description, after the advice of Gamaliel—Period of time probably before elapsed—Public or national considerations to engage the Jews from the eighteenth of Tiberius forward—The Sadducees all this time the leading party in the council—Sense of *ἡ οὐσα αἵρεσις*, and *ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ*—John and Alexander—Ananus or Annas and his five sons, and his son-in-law Caiaphas—Ananus, the younger, a Sadducee—One of the family of Annas, high priest at the death of Stephen 24—28

Martyrdom of Stephen coincident with the time of some feast—The Libertini, a nomen gentilitium—Connection of the Jews of Cyrene and Alexandria—Joint synagogues among the Jews—Number of synagogues at Jerusalem—Ethiopian eunuch returning from some feast, when converted by Philip—Candace, queen of Ethiopia in the time of Augustus—Name of Candace common to the queens of Ethiopia—Names of kings common to peculiar dynasties 28—31

Feast in question, the feast of Pentecost, U. C. 790—High priest who gave St. Paul his letters to Damascus, alive in the second of Nero—Ananias the son of Nebedæus, and Ananus the son of Seth—Jonathan, son of Ananus—Theophilus, son of Ananus—Letters of St. Paul given him by Theophilus—Resulting conclusion that they were given him, U. C. 790—No objection from the subsequent history of Philip the evangelist—Mention of the daughters of Philip, and place of their burial—Philip the evangelist, and Philip the apostle, confounded 31—33

Introduction of Christianity into Damascus, before the conversion of St. Paul, an argument of its comparative lateness after the martyrdom of Stephen—Gospel confined to Jerusalem, before the dispersion of the church at the death of Stephen—Dialect of Galilee, in distinction to that of Judæa—Preaching of the Gospel abroad, after the dispersion, confined to the Jews of Judæa—Hellenists, or Jews of the dispersion, opposed to Jews of Judæa—Native Jews abroad, alone subject to the jurisdiction of the sanhedrim—Introduction of Christianity into Damascus a recent event, and number of disciples still small—Saul, a young man at the death of Ste-

phen—Age of the *νεανίας* and the *πρεσβύτερος*—Reputed age of St. Paul at his death—Paul's sister's son—*Συγγενεῖς* of Paul—Probable history of Saul before the martyrdom of Stephen—Gamaliel—Holy Symeon—No part of Saul's residence at Jerusalem coincident with the personal ministry of our Saviour or John Baptist 33—37

Course of the history of St. Paul from the date of his conversion—Visit to Arabia—Date of the return to Damascus—Date of the first visit to Jerusalem after that event—Time of the visit, when a feast was going on—Departure of Paul to Cilicia 37—39

Date of the visit to Jerusalem, confirmed by the rest of the churches coincident with this departure—Rest of the churches synchronous with the attempt of Caius to erect his statue in the temple—Date of the visit confirmed by the history of Damascus—Damascus a part of the tetrarchy of Abilene—Lysanias—Herod Agrippa—Ethnarch of Damascus under Aretas—Ethnarch of Alexandria and Antioch—General name for the *ἄρχων*, or municipal governor, of the Jews of the dispersion, in foreign cities—Damascus, before and after the time of Pompey—Damascus, and the kings of Chalcis—Damascus, in the reign of Herod the Great—Damascus, after the death of Herod—Tetrarchy of Lysanias—Coins of Damascus—Lysanias of the Gospel, and probable date of his death—Time when Damascus might be in possession of Aretas, critically the last year of St. Paul's residence there—General conclusion resulting from all these premises, of the date of St. Paul's conversion, the martyrdom of Stephen, and the preaching of the Gospel to the Samaritans 39—46

Confirmation of the above conclusions, by the fact of another interval of seven years, between the preaching of the Gospel to the Samaritans, and the mission of St. Paul to the Gentiles: the conversion of Cornelius being the intermediate event 46

Traditionary date of the time before which the apostles were not to leave Jerusalem—Apollonius—The *Prædicatio Petri*—Conversion of Cornelius, between the Passover and Pentecost, U. C. 794—Date of the return of Paul and Barnabas from their eleemosynary visit to Judæa—Reign of Herod Agrippa, and date of his death—Time of the year, about the birthday of Claudius—Prediction of Agabus and its date—Famine predicted, consecutive on a Sab-

batic year—Moving cause to the collections at Antioch, mainly due to this fact—Confirmed by the only other collection, distinct from this, as similarly circumstanced—Date of the famine under Claudius—Procurators of Judæa, Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander—Rescript of Claudius, relating to the sacerdotal vestures—Helena, queen of the Adiabenes—Bardanes, king of Parthia—Date of the reduction of Seleucia—Vibius Marsus and Cassius Longinus—Artabanus and Izates—Coins of Artabanus, Bardanes, and Gotarzes—Meherdates—Philostratus' life of Apollonius—Homage of Artabanus to the statue of Caius—Darius the hostage—Famine of Dio, in the second or third of Claudius—Famine in Judæa, general over the empire—Famine in Africa in the proconsulship of Galba—Harbour of Ostia, and draining of the Fucine lake—Coins of Nero—Resulting conclusion of the date of the mission of Paul and Barnabas, and of the events before it, to the time of the conversion of Cornelius 46—58

Confirmation of this conclusion by the probable date of the appointment of St. James to be the first bishop of Jerusalem—No bishop of Jerusalem, while all the Apostles were there on the spot—Conversion of Cornelius, preparatory to the general extension of the Gospel abroad—Apostles not yet gone from Jerusalem, at the time of St. Paul's first visit, U. C. 794—Apostles no longer all resident in Jerusalem, at the death of James, U. C. 796—St. James not recognised as bishop of Jerusalem before the passover, U. C. 794—Recognised as such at the passover, U. C. 796—Resulting conclusion that he was appointed between the two, when the apostles were preparing to leave Judæa—This conclusion agreeable to the tradition above alluded to 58—61

General conclusion from all these premises, of the time of the actual mission of Paul and Barnabas to the Gentiles; Pentecost, May 21, U. C. 797—Measurement of these intervals by weeks, or halves of weeks, of years, no objection—First seven years of the ministry of St. Paul, from his conversion, the period within which some of the events in his history, alluded to in the Epistles, but not mentioned in the Acts, might have happened 61—63

Division of the prophecy into its two first portions of seven weeks, and sixty and two weeks, a phenomenon still requiring explanation—Final end of the first of these divisions to determine the ἀρχὴ of a new four hundred and eighty-three years, to the close of the

Jewish war—Close of the Jewish war, so determined, A. D. 75—
 Inductive proof from Josephus, that the war was not brought to a
 close before A. D. 75—Beginning of the war on the sixteenth of
 Artemisius, U. C. 819—Defeat of Cestius—Reduction of Jotapata
 —Death of Nero—First of Vespasian—Siege of Jerusalem—De-
 struction of the temple, Lous x. A. D. 70—Destruction of the city
 —Birthday of Vespasian—Triumph of Titus—Recapture of Ma-
 sada, Xanthicus xv. A. D. 73—Continuation of the war beyond
 this period—The false prophet Jonathan, and the temple of Onias
 in Egypt—Age of the temple at the time of its desecration—Date
 of the foundation of the temple, in the War of Josephus and in
 the Antiquities—Alexander Bala, and preceding kings of Syria—
 Date of the foundation followed by Josephus, that of the War—
 Flight of Onias, and sons of Tobias—Date of the suppression of
 the temple, A. D. 75 63—71

Life of Josephus, and History of the war of Justus of Tiberias—
 Death of Agrippa, and date in Photius—Disproof of the truth of
 that date—Order of the works of Josephus—Epaphroditus, to
 whom they are dedicated—Not Epaphroditus the freedman of
 Nero—Date of the Vita of Josephus—Coins of Agrippa, and pro-
 bable date of his death—Date of the Antiquities—Probable ac-
 count of the mistake of Photius—Allusion to Agrippa in Juvenal
 and Persius—Age of Juvenal—Institutes of Quintilian—Portus
 Trajani—Juvenal banished by Hadrian 71—75

Date of the suppression of the temple confirmed by the date of the
 præfecture of Egypt of Julius Lupus, præfect of Egypt at the
 time—Præfecture of Lupus determined by Pliny's *Historia Natu-
 ralis*—Date of the *Historia Naturalis*, U. C. 829 or U. C. 830—
 Death of Lupus, in office, in Josephus; not prior to U. C. 827, nor
 later than U. C. 829—Desecration begun by Lupus, before his
 death, completed by Paulinus, after it—Date of the desecration,
 U. C. 828—Further confirmation of these conclusions—Wives
 and children of Josephus—Josephus accused to Domitian—Date
 of the persecution of Christianity by Domitian 75—79

Date of the duration of the temple of Onias, according to Jerome—
 Temple probably destroyed by Vespasian, U. C. 830—Rebellion
 of the Jews of Egypt in the reign of Trajan—Distinction of Lu-
 sius Lupus, governor of Egypt at the time, and Lusius Quietus—His-
 tory of Lusius Quietus—Tradition of the Midrash Ruth—Penal

or probationary character of the number forty, or the term of forty years—Desecration of the temple of Onias, the extinction of practical Judaism any where in the world 79—81

DISSERTATION XVI.

On the two genealogies 82—107

Objections to the genealogies anciently—Celsus—Julian—Faustus the Manichæan 82—83

Reasons, *a priori*, why the genealogies should be considered probably distinct—Necessity of some genealogy of our Lord—Genealogical records of the Jews preserved after the captivity, as well as before—Our Saviour's descent liable to be deduced through both his reputed parents—As deduced through Joseph, not his true—Genealogy in St. Matthew not set forth as his true—True genealogy of our Lord deducible only through Mary—Genealogies among the Jews not usually deduced from females—True genealogy of our Lord itself, through Mary, consequently not to be nominally deduced from Mary—Natural genealogy of Joseph in St. Matthew, the legal genealogy of our Lord; natural genealogy of our Lord in St. Luke, the legal genealogy of Joseph—Mary the Virgin, traditionally the daughter of Eli, or Eliachim or Joachim, and Anna—Espoused to Joseph as next of kin—Injunction of the law with respect to the marriage of heiresses, still of force—Mary probably an orphan, at the time of her espousal to Joseph—Age of Mary and age of Joseph, at the time, according to tradition—Probable date of the death of Joseph—Date of the death of Mary 83—89

Reconciliation of the genealogies by Julius Africanus—Does not prove that Mary was descended from David—Joseph, on this principle, the son of Eli, not of Jacob—Reasons why St. Matthew might propose the genealogy of Joseph, as the genealogy of our Lord—End of a genealogy answered thereby—Object of Matthew's genealogy, to set forth our Lord as the heir to the promise of the throne of David—Promise of the kingdom to the descendants of David through Solomon—Not revoked, only suspended, in the persons of Shallum, Jehoiakim, Coniah, Jeconiah, or Zedekiah

—Centred in Joseph at the birth of Christ, and through him in Christ—Object of St. Luke's genealogy, to set forth our Lord as the seed promised to the woman 89—91

Observations upon each of the genealogies in particular—Promise of the Messiah restricted to the descendants of David and Bathsheba—Nathan a son of Bathsheba, as well as Solomon—Estha, reputed wife both of Matthan and Melchi—Joseph and Mary on that principle cousins—Probability that neither genealogy stands as it did originally—Omissions of names in St. Matthew, before the captivity, an argument of similar possible omissions after it—Number of names in St. Luke, in the time of Irenæus, Africanus, Prudentius, Ambrose, and Augustin—Supposed number of languages at the dispersion—The second Cainan—Number of steps from David to Neri, and from David to Jechonias, analogous—Average of generations from Solomon to Jechonias—Early marriages of the kings of Judah—Children of Jechonias after his captivity—Probable date of the birth of Salathiel—Salathiel and Zerubbabel, in the opinion of Josephus, both lineally descended from David—Union of the lines of Nathan and Solomon in the persons of Salathiel and Zerubbabel—Natural genealogy of Neri, the legal genealogy of Salathiel—Palmyrene genealogy of the son of Panus and Æranes—Zerubbabel, son of Pedaiah, distinct from Zerubbabel, son of Salathiel. 91—99

Average of generations in both lines from Salathiel to the birth of Christ—Parallel ratio of the generations of the contemporary high priests—Omissions of names in the line of Joseph, between Salathiel and Christ, a probable supposition—Average length of generations uniform, only on one supposition—Genealogy of Josephus, from the first year of John Hyrcanus to the first of Caius, an average of fifty-seven each—Further extension of this average in some of these steps—Omissions in St. Matthew, if any, have place between Azor and Matthan—Azor, contemporary with Nehemiah—Proof of the possibility of this fact—Zerubbabel—Abiud—Zadok—Jeshua—Joiakim—Eliashib—Joiada—Eliashib, in the line of descent, answerable to Abiud, and Azor, to the grandson of Eliashib. 100—104

No proof in the book of Nehemiah, that he was contemporary with any descendant of Eliashib lower than his grandson—Nehemiah

contemporary with Artaxerxes Longimanus, not Artaxerxes Mne-
mon—Johanan, son of Joiada—Jaddua, grandson of Joiada, and
great grandson of Eliashib—Drought, in the reign of Artaxerxes Lon-
gimanus—Xanthus the Lydian; and time when he was writing—Age
of Æsop—Capture of Sardis, in Suidas—Use of *γεγονώς*, in the sense
of *natus*—Empedocles—Xenophanes—Presence of Nehemiah in
Judæa, within the period embraced by the drought. . . . 104—107

DISSERTATION XVII.

*On the question, who are meant in the Gospels by the Ἀδελ-
φοὶ of Christ* 108—134

No proof in the Gospel history that Joseph was married or had any
children, before his espousal to the Virgin—No good reason to
suppose that Joseph and Mary might not have children after the
birth of Christ—First-born of Mary, as applied to Christ—Perpet-
tual virginity of Mary not recognised from the first, nor uniformly
ever after—Testimonies to that effect—*Δεσποσύναι*, or relations of
our Lord *κατὰ σάρκα*, in the time of Domitian 108—112

Ἀδελφοὶ or Ἀδελφαί, brethren or sisters of our Lord, in the Gospel
history—Implicitly recognised as the children of Mary, the mo-
ther of our Lord—Supposed double marriage of Joseph; contra-
dictory statements of tradition in reference to it—Joseph dead be-
fore John ii. 12 112—114

Names of the ἀδελφοὶ of our Lord—Joses, confounded with Joseph—
Brethren in question, up to a certain time, not believers, after it,
believers—Converted probably by the resurrection—Commenda-
tion of his mother by our Lord to St. John—Supposed relation-
ship of St. John and the Virgin—Maries alluded to in Scripture, and
their children—Inconsistency of these various accounts. . . 114—116

James, the son of Alphæus: an ἀδελφὸς of Christ—James a believer
in Christ, when the rest, described as his ἀδελφοὶ also, were unbe-
lievers—Various senses of the word ἀδελφὸς or ἀδελφὴ in Hebrew,
to describe either brothers or cousins—Examples of this mode of
speaking—Case of the brethren of Ahaziah—Mary the ἀδελφὴ
of the Virgin, yet the mother of James—Ἀδελφὴ as applied to
her, or ἀδελφὸς as applied to James, a cousin, not a brother or
sister—Mary, at this time, the wife of Cleopas, not the wife of Jo-
seph—Ellipsis of *γυνή* in Greek, and *uxor* in Latin—Cleopas, bro-
ther of Joseph. 116—119

Cousins of our Lord as such to be discriminated from his brethren—

His cousins, James and Joses—His brethren, Simon and Jude—James and Joses, children of Mary, the ἀδελφὴ of the Virgin—Disciples of our Lord, called Jude—Jude the apostle, brother of James—Son of Alphæus, but not of Mary—Matthew or Levi not the son of this Alphæus—Double marriage of Mary, as well as of Alphæus—Marriage at Cana, probably the marriage of Mary and Cleopas—James ὁμῆλιξ of our Saviour—Jude, the brother of James, not Jude the brother of our Lord; nor Simon the Cananite, Simon the brother of our Lord. 119—121

Confirmation of these conclusions—Brethren of our Lord, in the time of St. Paul, distinct from the apostles, and married men—Grandchildren of Jude in the reign of Domitian—Date of the persecution of Domitian—Bishops of Jerusalem after James—Second bishop, whether Symeon, son of Cleopas, or Simon, the brother of Jude—Reputed date of the martyrdom of Symeon—Date of the Eastern expedition of Trajan—Earthquake at Antioch—Epistle of Tiberianus—Atticus, governor of Syria—Palma, governor of Syria—Atticus, father of Herodes Atticus—Vir consularis, and when—Rebellion of the Jews in the nineteenth of Trajan—Persecutions against Christianity now going on—Lusius Quietus and Lusius Lupus—Resulting date of the martyrdom of Symeon, and his age at his death 121—128

Simon the Zealot, in St. Luke; and Simon the Cananite, in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Cananite, a *nomen gentilitium* from Canan—Sando, the Cananite, father of Athenodorus—Name of Zealot, not descriptive of one of the sect of the Zealots—Simon the Cananite probably not a Galilæan—Various readings of the name of Cananite—Simon the Cananite, and Simon son of Cleopas, distinct—Conjectural solution of these various accounts—Simon, the Cananite, second bishop of Jerusalem; Simon, reputed son of Cleopas, but actually brother of our Lord, the third—Simon, the Cananite, might be a son of Cleopas—Dates of their births and deaths respectively, on this principle 128—133

Ἀδελφαὶ, or sisters of our Lord, more properly his cousins—Ἀδελφαὶ of our Lord, living at Nazareth; ἀδελφοὶ, and Mary the Virgin, living at Capernaum—Cleopas, probably a native or inhabitant of Nazareth, Mary of Cana—Age of Simon, son of Cleopas, at the time of the marriage of Cleopas and Mary 133—134

DISSERTATION XVIII.

On the visit of the Magi.....135—147

Time of the arrival of the Magi, determinable from the time of the appearance of the star—Age of the star, determined by the age of the children—Limits of the age defined by ἀπὸ διετούς καὶ κατωτέρω—Rule of the Jews in the reckoning of ages—Testimony of Macrobius—Appearance of the star, not more than thirteen months before the arrival of the Magi 135—137

Quarter from which the Magi came, Upper Asia—The principal seat of the Magian philosophy, Asia—Length of the journey from Upper Asia to Jerusalem, a four months' interval—Cases in point to the proof of this assertion—Mission of Nehemiah, and dates connected with it—Fasts of the Jews, whether originally the second and fifth days of the week—Probable corruption of the date at Ezekiel xxxiii. 21—Magnitude of the Persian empire, Xenophon, Ctesias, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Lucian, Itinerarium Alexandri—News of the capture of Athens, as transmitted by Xerxes to Susa—Computation of Chrysostom of the distance of Ur in Chaldæa from Canaan 137—142

Time between the arrival of the Magi and the appearance of the star, in one sense four weeks, in another thirteen—Double resulting appearance of the star, first at the Incarnation, and again at the Nativity—Early appearance of the star, an ancient tradition—Nature of the star, indifferent to the present question—Magi, aware of its meaning—Prophecy of Balaam—Magi, reputed descendants of Balaam—Magi, directed all through as instruments—Advantages of the supposition of a double appearance of the star, to explain the order of Herod—Advent of the Magi, the first intimation of the communication of Gospel privileges to the Gentiles—Parallelism of the dispensation in behalf of the Gentiles, in its leading steps, to that in behalf of the Jews 141—146

Probable date of the arrival of the Magi, supposing them to have set out at the Nativity—Consequent date of the flight into Egypt, and length of the residence there 146, 147

DISSERTATION XIX.

On the ministry of John the Baptist..... 148—191.

Question of the duration of the ministry of John—Probable date of

the imprisonment of John—Double commencement and double termination of the ministry of Jesus Christ—Ministry of Jesus not absolutely over, before the day of the ascension into heaven—Day of the ascension into heaven, probably the date of the imprisonment of John—Resulting conclusion of the absolute length of the ministry of John. 148—150

Order and distribution of the ministry of John—Characters, in which John is described as appearing, fourfold—Reduction of these characters to two—Baptism of John, the sign and seal of his commission, and of the belief of the recipient in it—Baptism of John, the designation for the complex of his ministry 150—152

The first character, in which the Baptist would appear, his true and proper one—Description of the character of John in this respect, identical with that of our Saviour in the same—Character of the Herald of the kingdom, ascribed to Christ at the outset of his ministry, true of the same at every subsequent period of it, and nothing distinct from John's—Mission of the Twelve—Mission of the Seventy—Ministry of the Baptist, of our Lord, of the Twelve, and of the Seventy, in this respect, one and the same. 152—158

No circumstance of distinction between the public ministry of John, and the public ministry of Jesus Christ, except that John baptized, but Jesus Christ did not—Ministry of John, as the counterpart of that of Jesus Christ, not affected by this distinction—Water baptism of John, typical of the Spirit baptism of Jesus Christ—Baptism of John no type of Christian baptism, but of the baptism with the Holy Ghost—Proofs of the truth of this conclusion from Scripture—Descent of the Holy Ghost, at the baptism of Christ, and abiding upon him, might prefigure this future truth—Tradition of the appearance of fire at the baptism of Jesus Christ... 158—162

Further proofs of the identity of the ministry of John, and of Jesus Christ—Exordium of St. Mark's Gospel—Question and reply to the question, *ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς*—The kingdom of heaven suffering violence—Date of this violence from the beginning of the ministry of John—The Law and the Prophets until John—Ministry of John, alike analogous to that of the prophets before him, and to that of the evangelists after him—"He that cometh after me is preferred before me"—Ὀπίσω and ἔμπροσθεν, descriptive of order

of place—Christ, though coming after John, why become before him—John Baptist, why the greatest of prophets, yet the least in the kingdom of heaven—Dignity of office, not dignity of character, involved in this distinction—Personal ministry of Jesus Christ, on the same principle, subordinate to the personal ministry of his apostles—Part to be sustained by Jesus Christ, distinct from the ministry of John, and necessary to that of the apostles, what—Case of Apollos, and the disciples at Ephesus—General conclusion of the subserviency of the personal ministry of John, and of that of Jesus Christ, alike, to the ministration of the Messiah, or the ministration of the kingdom, as distinct from the propagation of the Gospel 162—170

Objection to the above conclusion—Personal relation of the Baptist to Jesus Christ, as a precursor or herald of his coming—Truth of this personal relation, not affected by the conclusion in question—Personal testimony of John to Christ, a kind of *παρέργον* in comparison of his proper office—Personal testimony of John to Christ, supposes his authority, as an herald of the kingdom, admitted—Personal testimony of John as *general*, or as *particular*, necessarily distinct—Particular testimonies of John, nowhere on record in the first three Gospels—Final end of the personal testimony, not the advent but the person of the Christ—First general personal testimony of John, much later than the beginning of his ministry—Allusion of Luke iii. 15-18, and of St. Paul in the Acts, xiii. 25. to the same occasion in the ministry of John—Personal testimony of John as such, never appealed to as the proper testimony on behalf of our Lord—Testimony of John, in comparison of his works or miracles, secondary and inferior—Representations of the prophets of the effect or purpose of the ministry of John, in what sense to be understood—Changes or effects predicted, moral—Changes and effects, to be wrought in subserviency to the purpose of the ministration of the Messiah generally—United effect of the labours both of John and of Jesus Christ, to prepare the way for the ministry of the apostles 171—182

Details of the parts or proceedings of the ministry of John—Feast of Tabernacles, U.C. 779—Commencement of the ministry of John, October 5 after the feast—Beginning of the autumnal rains—Interval of time, from October 5 to the close of the ministry of John—Wilderness of Judæa, the scene of the ministry of John, what—Villages in the deserts—Perichorus or Aulon of Jordan—

Traditionary locality of Bethabara, or Bethany beyond Jordan— Resort of the people to John—Harmony of the accounts of his ad- dress to the Scribes and Pharisees—Particulars of the history of John, after the baptism of Jesus Christ, to be collected from the last Gospel only—Baptism of our Lord the middle point in the ministry of John—First personal testimony of John to Christ, after the baptism, his answer to the question of the sanhe- drim	182—187
Person of Christ, before the baptism, unknown to John—Nazaritism of John, and bringing up in the desert—Knowledge of the person of Christ at the baptism, supernaturally communicated to John— Descent of the Spirit, not intended to point out the person, but to designate the office of Christ—Baptism of Christ, at this time, at the hands of John, why necessary to fulfil all righteousness— Levitical priesthood, a type of the Christian—John Baptist com- petent to represent the Levitical high priest—Vicar of the high priest, or next in dignity to the Levitical high priest—Consecra- tion necessary to the ministry of the Levitical high priest—Instru- mentality of a priest necessary to the consecration of a priest— Baptism of our Lord, with its accompanying circumstances, the ceremony of his consecration for his ministry	187—191

DISSERTATION XX.

<i>On the order of the temptations</i>	192—196
Order of the temptations in the different accounts, distinct—Difference of disposal in the parts of the account, no objection to the whole's being related in its place	192
Order of St. Matthew the true, yet St. Luke's not properly a trajec- tion—Mysterious character of the Temptation—Reality of the parties concerned in it—General outline of its nature and pur- poses—Each temptation, a specimen of a class—Temptations, ad- dressed to distinct principles of our nature—Order of temptations, the order of strength—Proximate cause of each temptation—Pur- pose of each temptation, tentative—Proper object of the third in St. Matthew, would make that appear the strongest in the eyes of the Jews, and proper object of the second, would make that seem so in the eyes of the Gentiles—Change of the order of St. Matthew by St. Luke, accounted for upon this princi- ple	192—195

Confirmation of the above view, by St. John's classification of impure desires—Classical sense of *ἀλαζονεία* as opposed to *ἀλήθεια*—Distinguishing characteristic of the philosophers of the age—Description of the Stoics by Mucian. 195—196

DISSERTATION XXI.

On the hiatus in the first three Gospels between the time of the baptism of our Saviour, and the commencement of his ministry in Galilee; and on its supplement by the Gospel of St. John 197—231

Supplementary character of the Gospel of St. John—Omission in the former accounts, between the baptism of Jesus and the commencement of his ministry in Galilee—Commencement of the strictly historical part of the Gospel of St. John—Presupposes the baptism, and beginning of the forty days' fast—Bears date not earlier than the day after the close of the fast—Interval between John i. 19. and iv. 1. the measure of the hiatus in the preceding accounts—Filled up by St. John, by beginning where they had left off, and leaving off where they had begun again . . . 197—201

Proofs of each of these positions—Accounts of John break off with the second journey into Galilee—The second journey into Galilee the same with the journey into Galilee of the other accounts, followed by the commencement of the ministry of Jesus there—Accounts of the other evangelists broke off with the close of the forty days' fast—Accounts of St. John begin with the day after the same—Locality of the Temptation—Jesus would return to Bethabara from it, as well as proceed from Bethabara to it—Deputation of the sanhedrim to John—Two days' residence of Jesus at Bethabara. 201—204

Interval between the point where the accounts of St. John begin, and where they break off—Passover, John ii. 13, an intermediate date—Calculation of the interval upwards to this, from the time of the conference with the sanhedrim—Measure of time between the baptism and the arrival at Jerusalem, ii. 13—Time necessary to travel to, and return from, the scene of the Temptation—Beer-sheba—Tekoah—Petra and Jericho—March of Athenæus in Diodorus—Rate of a day's march in ancient times—Tabor—Quarantaria 204—209

Calculation of the interval downwards, from the Passover to the re-

turn into Galilee—Distance of Sychar from Jerusalem—Uncertainty on no point but the length of the residence in Judæa—Length of this residence, not more than a month—John, not yet cast into prison when Jesus set out for Samaria—John, cast into prison when he arrived in Galilee—John, probably imprisoned on one of the days which he passed at Sychar—May 16, the date of the ascension, U. C. 783, the probable date of the imprisonment of John, U. C. 780—Date of the departure from Jerusalem, April 17 or 18—Date of the arrival at Sychar, May 13 or 14... 209—214

Confirmation of these conclusions by various circumstantial allusions—Locality of *Ænon* and *Salem*—Hours of St. John, and time of the day when Jesus arrived at *Gerizim*—Fetching or drawing of water in the East, the work of women, and times of it morning and evening—Wells of great antiquity in the East—Hypothesis of *Bretschneider*, that the woman came not from Sychar, but Samaria—Name of Samaria, at this time *Sebaste*—Sychar the ancient *Shechem*—*Flavia Neapolis*—*Gerizim*—Rate of a day's journey—Journey of the messengers of *Cornelius* from *Cæsarea* to *Joppa*—Length of the journey through Samaria into Galilee—Distance of Sychar from the frontiers of Judæa—Day of the arrival at Sychar, Thursday May 13—Date of the departure, Sunday May 16—Reception of Jesus by the Galileans—Miracles at the *Passover*, recent events—Proximity of harvest, when Jesus passed through Samaria, and literal construction of John iv. 35—Sense of the allusion to seed time—Language of our Lord on this occasion, to be explained by the idiom of prophecy—No mission of the disciples, as yet, nor hereafter, before the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, such as is here implied—Barley harvest and wheat harvest in Judæa—Interval between each and the corresponding seed time, four months—Harvest in Egypt—Harvest at the *Exodus*—Comment of *Origen* on the sense of the passage—Literal seed time, inconsistent with the circumstances of the time of the journey through Samaria—Anachronism in the system of archbishop Newcome 214—229

Detail of particulars in St. John's Gospel, after the arrival in Galilee—Declaration of Jesus that "a prophet had no honour in his own country"—Not in allusion to the proceedings in the synagogue at Nazareth—Reference in those proceedings to the miracle at Cana, which came to pass in Capernaum—Visit to Cana prior to the visit to Nazareth—Utility of the account of the miracle at

Cana in St. John, to clear up the allusion in the account of proceedings at Nazareth in St. Luke. 229—231

DISSERTATION XXII.

Coincidence of a sabbatic year with the beginning of our Saviour's ministry 232—244

Sabbatic years observed after the captivity, as well as before—Sabbatic years observed by the Samaritans, as well as the Jews. . . 232—233

Proofs from contemporary history, of seven distinct sabbatic years between B. C. 163. and A. D. 69—Table of sabbatic years for the period in question—Journey through Samaria coincided with the last half of the sixth year before the twenty-eighth. . . . 233—236

Jewish computation of sabbatic years, as distinct from the preceding—Sabbatic year, A. D. 69, traditionary—Tradition, not inconsistent with the testimony of Josephus—Sabbatic year implicitly recognised by Josephus, A. D. 69—70, in the account of the siege of Jerusalem—Supplies of corn, A. D. 70, drawn by the besiegers from Syria. 236—239

Years of jubile and sabbatic years, distinct—Sabbatic years after the return from captivity—First sabbatic year in course after the return, B. C. 534—Sabbatic years observed from the time of Nehemiah downwards 239—241

Date of the cycles of sabbatic years, B. C. 1513—Sabbatic year, B. C. 709, in the reign of Hezekiah—Sabbatic year, in the ninth of Zedekiah, B. C. 590.—Suspension and resumption of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar—Tenth of Tebeth in the ninth of Zedekiah, when the siege was resumed, and ninth of the fourth month in the eleventh, when the city was taken, and Julian dates answering to each. 241—244

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART I.

General prospective survey of the ministry of our Lord in Judæa 245—261

Public ministry of our Lord, divided into his ministry in Judæa and his ministry in Galilee—Ministry in Judæa, confined on the whole to St. John. 245

Times and occasions of our Lord's residing in Judæa, distinct from his attendances at Jerusalem.....	245—247
Times and occasions of the attendances at Jerusalem—These times and occasions on record in the Gospel of St. John, all the times and occasions that Jesus went up to Jerusalem—Proofs of this position	247
Ministry in Judæa defective in the other Gospels; and supplied by St. John's—Our Lord under no necessity of attending every legal solemnity—Many instances in the course of his ministry, of feasts which he did not attend—Encænïa, John x. 22, the Encænïa before the last Passover, and next after Tabernacles, John vii. 2—No attendance of Jesus at Jerusalem, between Tabernacles, John vii. 2. and the feast, John v. 1—Reference at Tabernacles, John vii. 2, to the miracle at the pool of Bethesda, John v. 1—Feast indefinitely described, John v. 1, a Passover—Systematic offence of the Jews, with Jesus, for the supposed breach of the sabbath, directly referred by St. John to the miracle wrought at the attendance, John v. 1—Indirectly confirmed by the first three evangelists, in the account of the walking through the fields of corn—Date of this walking, the first regular sabbath after the sixteenth of Nisan—General conclusion—No attendance of Jesus at Jerusalem between John v. 1. and vii. 2. a period of eighteen months.....	247—259
General inferences from the above survey—Confirmation of the assumed regularity and supplementary relations of St. John—Proofs of <i>four</i> distinct Passovers in the Gospel history—Difference in the rule of our Lord's attendance at Jerusalem for the last six months of his ministry, and before—Greater importance of attendance at the Passover, than at any other feast—No attendance at Pentecost, mentioned or implied in the Gospel history—Reference of this feast in particular, to the future events of the Christian dispensation	259—261

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART II.

<i>General prospective survey of the ministry of our Lord in Galilee, year the first.....</i>	<i>262—299</i>
Time of the return into Galilee preparatory to the commencement of	

the ministry there—Visit to Cana, visit to Nazareth, visit to Capernaum, consecutive—Consistency of the several accounts. . . 262—265

Choice of Capernaum, preliminary to the commencement of the ministry in question—Necessity of some fixed place of our Lord's abode—Nazareth might be intended originally as that place—Fulfilment of prophecy, and site of Capernaum—Capernaum, why to be chosen on these accounts, more than any other city on the Lake—Land of Gennesaret, and description of it from Josephus—Choice of Capernaum not inconsistent with the declaration, "the foxes have holes," &c. 265—270

Commencement of the ministry in Galilee, coincident with the feast of Pentecost—Objection, in the account of proceedings in the synagogue of Nazareth—Hapthoroth, or lessons of the modern Jews—Isaiah possibly in course about the feast of Pentecost, not the feast of Tabernacles—Proceedings in the synagogue at Nazareth, with respect to the lesson of the day, irregular—Rolls or volumes of the Old Testament anciently—Prophecy in question purposely selected, because of its applicability to the commencement of our Saviour's ministry—General propriety of the period of Pentecost, as the time of the commencement of our Saviour's ministry. 270—276

Distribution of the course of our Saviour's ministry subsequently—Circuits of Galilee, general or partial—Object and limitation of the proposed prospective survey—Years of its duration, and the ἀρχὴ of each 276—277

Interval between the arrival in Galilee, and the teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum—Feast of Pentecost, *after* the visit to Nazareth but *prior* to the teaching at Capernaum—Date of the feast of Pentecost, U. C. 780—Date of the arrival at and departure from Sychar—Date of the Sabbath at Nazareth—Date of the teaching in Capernaum—Date of the first circuit of Galilee—Week of our Lord's history transacted at Capernaum 277—280

Call of the four disciples—Date of the call, the day before the teaching in the synagogue—Call of the four Disciples *now*, consistent with St. John's account of what had passed between them and Jesus *before*—Disciples in question, disciples of John, before they became disciples of Jesus—No call on the part of Jesus implied in

what passed before—Name of Peter proleptically given to Simon—Probable that our Lord personally called only these four—Attendance of disciples on Jesus before this period—Discipleship as such, dated by St. Peter from the close of the ministry of John—Disciples might continue their journey to Galilee, when Jesus remained at Sychar—Pentecost a one day's feast—Possible for the disciples to have attended the feast in Jerusalem, yet to be returned to Capernaum before the call 280—288

Teaching in Capernaum—Miracles there the same day—First circuit of Galilee, Sunday June 6—Probable duration of the circuits of Galilee—Periphery of Galilee—Number of towns and villages of Galilee, and average population of each—Duration of a circuit not less than three, and probably as much as four months—Coincidence of the time of the year of these circuits, with the period between Pentecost and Tabernacles 288—293

Course of the first circuit—Disciples, probably called upon it—Closed by the Sermon on the Mount 293—294

Miracle on the Lake of Capernaum—Cure of the Leper—Locality, not at Capernaum—Jesus engaged somewhere, distinct from Capernaum—Miracle of the leper, the first of its kind which had yet occurred—Miracles of our Saviour, restricted for a time to what—Subject of the miracle possibly Simon the Leper—Retirement which followed the miracle—Return to Capernaum δι' ἡμερῶν—Cure of the paralytic—Κωμῶν γραμματεῖς—Scribes, lawyers, and doctors of the law, the same—Constituent parts of the Jewish sanhedrim—Cure of the paralytic, about the feast of Encænïa—Call of Levi—Τελώνιον, or receipt of custom—Feast of Levi. . 295—299

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART III.

General prospective survey of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, year the second 300—351

Walking through the corn fields—Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον—"Απαξ λεγόμενα in the Gospels—Τὸν ἐπιούσιον—Classical sense of ἡ ἐπιούσα—Explanation of the text by the ancients—Criticism of Toup on the derivation of ἐπιούσιος—Πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν, Luke ii. 34—Classical sense of ἀνάστασις—Propriety of this sense to the con-

text—Composition of *δευτερόπρωτον*—Computation of Pentecost—Rule of the Sadducees, and rule of the Pharisees—Occasional coincidence of both—John Hyrcanus and Antiochus Sidetes—Date of the death of Antiochus—*Ἀναία* or *Ἀναίτις*—Calculation of Pentecost, B. C. 133—Coincidence of both modes of reckoning in the year of the Passion—Conjectural explanation of *δευτερόπρωτον* by Scaliger—Objection to this explanation, that *weeks* were commanded to be reckoned by the Jews, but *δευτερόπρωτον* is the denomination of a *day*, and that the Sabbath day—Probable true explanation of *δευτερόπρωτον*, to denote the seventeenth of Nisan—Nisan 17, A. D. 28, actually fell on the Sabbath—Rationale of this explanation—*Δευτερόπρωτος* properly both *second* and *first*—*Νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, as opposed to the ordinary *νυχθήμερα* of the days of the month—Consisted of a morning and evening, not of an evening and a morning—Bisected by the ordinary *νυχθήμερα* of the month—Expressed in terms of the *νυχθήμερα* of the month, consisted of the morning of the preceding and the evening of the succeeding: or were something made up of both, and *vice versa*—*Δευτερόπρωτον*, a designation chosen by St. Luke, to express with the greatest propriety the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan, in terms of the corresponding *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, or feast of weeks—The designation, *δευτερόπρωτον*, and not *πρωτοδεύτερον*, why—Importance of these conclusions, to the assumed coincidences of days of the month and days of the week—Date of the miracle at the pool of Bethesda—Ancient explanations of *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον*—Explanation of Ambrose—Ripeness of corn both at Passover and Pentecost—Productions of a year of rest—The right of any, but the owners of the soil—Constitutions of Joshua, and right of way through the sown grounds. . 300—319

Miracle of the withered hand—Jesus in Capernaum—Supplementary relation of the two latter evangelists to the former—Pharisees and Herodians—First partial circuit of Galilee—*Πλοιάρια* on the Lake of Galilee—Description of the Lake of Galilee—Mary of Magdala—Proseuchæ—Ordination of the Twelve—Cure of the centurion's servant—Visit to Nain—Miracle of the widow's son—Burying without the walls, among the Jews—Message of John—Machærus—Unction in the house of Simon—Woman, a native or inhabitant of Nain 319—328

Second general circuit of Galilee—Omission in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Return to Capernaum, after or about the feast of Taber-

nacles—Parable of the sower, and allusion to seed time therein—Storm on the Lake of Galilee—Presence of Scribes from Jerusalem—An argument of a recent feast, and a feast not attended by our Lord—Length of the stay at Capernaum, after the return, two days; and the causes to which it was due—Details of proceedings, from the time of the return to the time of the departure, including the visit to Gadara—Resort of the multitude after this return, a new resort—Attempt of the relations of our Lord—Cure of the demoniac blind and dumb—Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost—Parables—Visit to Gadara or Gergesa—Night, spent by Jesus on the Lake—Time of the return to Capernaum—Intermediate events, and departure of Jesus to Nazareth 328—340

Third general circuit of Galilee—Death of John Baptist—Mission of the Twelve—Place of the mission, Capernaum—Second partial Circuit of Galilee—Return of the Twelve, and departure of Jesus across the Lake to Bethsaida—Locality of this Bethsaida—Bethsaida of Galilee—Bethsaida of Philip, or Julias—Bethsaida in Decapolis, on the south-west of the Lake—Journey of the people from Capernaum, to meet our Lord on the other side of the Lake—First miracle of feeding, and harmony of the Gospel accounts—Ὁψία πρώτη, and ὁψία δεῖλη—Walking on the sea, and fourth watch of the night—Progress through the district of Gennesaret—Discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum 340—351

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART IV.

General prospective survey of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee; first six months of year the third 352—382

Passover of this year, the only one not attended in person by our Lord—Passover this year, fell as late as it could 352—353

Question concerning eating with unwashen hands—Visit to the parts of Tyre and Sidon—Character of Philip the tetrarch—Sarepta or Zarephath—Miracle of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter—Supplementary character of St. Mark's account—Return of Jesus to Decapolis, and the course he took—Second miracle of feeding—Σπυρίδες and κόφινοι—Lateness of the season, when the second miracle was performed, in comparison of the first—Ship, which conveyed Jesus from Decapolis—Visit to Magdala or Dal-

manutha—Distance of Magdala from Capernaum—Demand of a sign from heaven—Supplementary character of St. Mark's account—Return of Jesus to Peræa—Leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees—Bethsaida in Galilee, and Bethsaida in Decapolis—Κωμοπόλεις of Judæa—Miracle at Bethsaida, and peculiar character of it 352—367

Departure of Jesus to the parts of Cæsarea Philippi—Confession of Peter—First particular prediction of the death and resurrection of Jesus—Transfiguration—Interval between the confession and the Transfiguration—Transfiguration took place at night—Probable date of the day when it happened, and consequent date of the confession of Peter—Locality of the Transfiguration—Description of Tabor—Τὸ Ἰραβύριον ὄρος—Mount of Beatitudes—Time of the Transfiguration, in the events of this year—Object of the evangelical accounts, in this part of their history—Transfiguration, May 27—Epileptic demoniac after the Transfiguration—Peculiarity of the case of epileptic possession—Sojourn of Jesus in Galilee—Return to Capernaum, and time of the year when it happened—Demand of the tribute money—Tribute in question, not the tax due to the Roman government—Reasoning of Jesus, in excuse of the demand—Tax of the half-shekel or δίδραχμον—Josephus, and Philo Judæus—Times of the payment of the δίδραχμα—Doctrine of the Mishna on that subject—Demand of the tribute money, an argument that the feast of Tabernacles was at hand 367—378

Course and continuation of the Gospel history from this time forward—Recapitulation or summary of the preceding survey—Second year of our Lord's ministry full of action and employment throughout—Difference in the conduct of our Lord for the first six months of the third year and the last, as well as the two preceding years, and probable explanation of both 378—382

DISSERTATION XXIV.

Comparison of the call of the four disciples (Matt. iv. 18—22. Mark i. 16—20.) and of the miraculous draught of fishes, (Luke v. 1—11.) 383—396

Differences observable in the account of the draught in St. Luke, and in that of the call in St. Matthew and St. Mark; arguing the distinctness of the one from the other 383—385

Additional arguments to the same effect—The fishing over in St. Luke, about to begin in Matthew and Mark—Times of fishing, according to Aristotle and Oppian—Resort of people to the sea-shore, to breakfast on newly taken fish—Allusion to the name of Simon in St. Luke—Teaching, which preceded the call—Anxiety of the people to hear our Lord—Teaching of our Lord, begun in the synagogue at Capernaum, not on the Lake—Teaching, which now took place, an ordinary instance of the kind—Characteristic of our Saviour's manner of teaching, its being with authority—Title of *ἐπιστάτης*, or Master, at this time applied to Jesus by Peter—Peter acquainted already with the power of Jesus—Miracle would not have been omitted in the history of the call, if it had formed a part of it 385—393

Foundation of the supposed trajection in St. Luke, a mistaken apprehension of the nature and design of the miraculous draught—No call addressed to the apostles at the time, in the words of Jesus—No call implied in the nature of the event itself—The miracle a symbolical act, to predict the success of those persons as apostles, who had had such success as fishermen—Proper use of the miracle consequently, to presuppose a call as disciples, but to precede an ordination as apostles—Difference of language of our Saviour on each occasion, explained on this principle—Call, understood by the disciples to be final, after this last event, but not after the former. 393—396

DISSERTATION XXV.

On the call of Levi, and the entertainment which followed the call: or Mark ii. 13—22. Luke v. 27—39. compared with Matt. ix. 9—17 397—410

Date of the call of Matthew, in the course of our Lord's ministry—Matthew, the same with Levi—Calls of disciples by our Lord in person, all on record—Effect of the call in each instance, not the call itself, the thing to be principally regarded. 397—398

Feast of Levi or Matthew, differently placed in the different accounts—Reasons *a priori*, why the occasions should be considered distinct—Feast of St. Matthew not given in the house of Levi—Feast of Levi simultaneous with the call of Levi, feast in St. Matthew not—Feast of Levi recorded, not on its own account, but from its connection with the history of our Lord himself, and

the exceptions taken to his conduct—Feast of Levi probably a supper, feast in St. Matthew, the morning or noon day's repast—Feast in St. Matthew, given at a time when Levi or Matthew had forsaken *all* things—Personal connection of the feast of Levi or Matthew with his own call, a probable reason why St. Matthew should omit the account of it in its proper place 398—405

Confirmation of the above conclusions by the circumstantial differences in the respective accounts—Matthew's feast an ordinary, Levi's an extraordinary occasion, of our Lord's sitting at meat—Disciples of John present at Matthew's, not present at Levi's feast—Account of the questions and answers on each occasion, nearer to a resemblance in Mark and Luke, than in either and Matthew—Distinction of *νηστεύειν* and *πενθεῖν*—Supplemental relation of Luke v. 36 to Mark ii. 21—Nature of the reasoning in each of these instances, the same *in genere*, but different *in specie*—Antecedent improbability of the distinctness of the two occasions, small 405—410

DISSERTATION XXVI.

On the ordination of the Twelve—and the Sermons from the Mount 411—414

Date of the ordination of the Twelve, in the course of our Saviour's ministry—Distinction of the future apostles up to this time, what—Omission of the ordination by St. Matthew—Place and designation of Matthew, in the list of apostles. 411—412

Junction of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, with the account of the ordination of the Twelve—Further argument of the time of this event, relatively to the Christian ministry—Phrase of *οἱ δώδεκα, οἱ δέκα, οἱ ἑνδεκα*—Immediate object of the ordination of the apostles, referred to their character in that respect in our Lord's life time, as much as after his death—Name of Peter, as opposed to Simon—Imposition of new names with new characters in the East—Name of Peter in St. Matthew—Name of Peter in St. John—Name of the sons of Zebedee, Boanerges—Simon not yet an apostle, when he had not received the name of Peter—None of the Twelve personally called by our Lord, but those whose calls are on record 412—416

Ordination of the Twelve, probably about Pentecost in our Lord's

second year—Peter distinguished by an honorary preeminence from that time forward—Order of the names in each of the lists—Order different before and after the resurrection	416—419
Names of the apostles recited in couplets—Whether an intentional peculiarity or not—Expediency of the Twelve's remaining some time as disciples, before they became apostles—Fitness of the persons, chosen to be apostles—Exception of Judas Iscariot—Number of apostles, referred to the number of the tribes—An extra apostle provided for the Gentiles	419—420
Immediate and future object of the ordination of the Twelve—Kind and degree of miraculous power imparted to the Twelve—Twelve, in these respects, not distinguished from the Seventy—Importance of the event of the ordination of the Twelve in our Saviour's ministry—Peculiar solemnity of the circumstances before and during it—Twelve, probably ordained with prayer and imposition of hands	421—422
Sermon which followed the ordination, altogether the same with St. Matthew's, or altogether distinct—Reasons <i>a priori</i> for considering it distinct, or St. Matthew's a regular account—Place of the sermon in the narrative, on either hypothesis—Multitudes present at the time—Teaching of our Lord as such, and recorded instances thereof—Manner of our Lord's teaching, and inference deducible from the remark upon it—Brevity of St. Matthew in the historical parts of his narrative, and fulness in his account of discourses	422—427
Distinction of circumstances, before and after the two sermons respectively—Distinction of the two sermons themselves, when compared together—St. Luke's, no epitome of St. Matthew's sermon—St. Luke's, no selection from St. Matthew's sermon—Omissions in St. Luke, and rule by which they are regulated—Exordiums and conclusions of the sermons, more particularly—Number of beatitudes in St. Luke's, determined by the number of woes ; and both, only three—Same terms in St. Matthew figurative, in St. Luke literal—General resemblance of the two sermons, but particular or individual distinctness of either from the other.	427—434

DISSERTATION XXVII.

*On the beginning to teach in Parables, and on the time and place of their interpretation.....*435—447

Difficulty connected with this subject, unexplained by former harmonists—Time and place of the beginning to teach in parables, uniformly represented in all the accounts—Interpretation of parables, now delivered, apparently differently represented...435—437

No interpretation of any of the parables delivered in public, accorded except in private—Testimony of St. Mark—*Kar' idíav*, incapable of being rendered *aside*—Interpretation of the sower, in particular, delivered when Jesus was alone—Compliment of vessels on the Lake of Tiberias—*Oí ἔξω*, in the words of our Saviour, as opposed to those within—Question, Why he was teaching in parables, might be put by the disciples in public—Parables all over before the interpretation of the first of the number 437—441

Place of the interpretation of the parable of the sower in St. Matthew, and reasons of its position, consistent with the above explanation—No request of the interpretation in question affirmed by him—Question, affirmed by him, not What might this parable be, but, Why teachest thou in parables—Answer to St. Matthew's question, as recorded by him, the proper answer to the previous inquiry, and answer to St. Mark's, as recorded by him, the same—Parts of the answer, apparently the same in each, yet distinct 441—444

Harmony of the several accounts, on the above principles—Explanation of the parable in St. Mark, where it stands, not a proper anticipation—In St. Matthew, an anticipation, and why.. 444—445

General observations—Number of parables now delivered—Omissions of some of the number in St. Matthew—Omissions in St. Mark—Omissions in St. Luke—Verbal agreement or disagreement, in the account of the same parables, between the several narratives—Verbal agreement, how far to be expected in the account of parables more particularly 445—447

DISSERTATION XXVIII.

On the question concerning eating with unwashen hands,
 Matthew xv. 1—20. Mark vii. 1—23 448—463

Distribution of the accounts with a view to their harmony—Proofs
 of omissions in each part, in St. Matthew, supplied by St. Mark—
 Allusion to the offence of the Pharisees in St. Matthew, why omitted
 by St. Mark 448—450

Differences between the accounts in this instance, not resolvable solely
 into omissions on the one hand, and supplements on the other—
 Difference, a difference of order and statement, more than of sub-
 stance—Order of St. Matthew's the true, yet St. Mark's not at
 variance with it—Law of tradition, as distinguished from the writ-
 ten law of God—Rise of the Pharisees—Traditionary law did not
 call in question the authority of the written—Laws of tradition, if
 opposed to the written law, could not be laws of God—Vow of
 Corban; daughter of Jephthah, and consecration of Samuel—Tra-
 ditionary perversion of the vow of Corban—Breaches of the third
 commandment, sanctioned by the law of tradition, as well as those of
 the fifth—Proofs of the explanation in question—Corban, forbidden
 by the Tyrians—Explanation of Chrysostom and Origen... 450—459

Harmony of the two accounts, upon the above principles, and gen-
 eral observations on the whole—St. Mark, not the abbreviator of
 St. Matthew—St. Mark, wrote after the Gospel had begun to be
 preached to the Gentiles, and before the destruction of Jeru-
 salem—St. Luke, presupposes St. Matthew's Gospel or St.
 Mark's 459—463

DISSERTATION XXIX.

*On the first instance of the dispute among the disciples con-
 cerning precedence* 464—481

Reasons for detaching Mark ix. 33—end, and Luke ix. 46—50. from
 Matt. xviii. 1—9—Course of proceedings, between the time of the
 return to Capernaum, and question recorded Matt. xviii. 1—Dis-
 pute of the disciples on the way—Demand of the tribute money—
 Mission of Peter to the Lake—Why commanded to pay the tribute
 in a stater, or double didrachmum—Dispute of the disciples, not
 resolvable into this circumstance—Question of our Lord to the

disciples about the cause of their dispute, not answered by them—Question of the disciples, Who was the greatest, put of their own accord—Reason of this distinction, probably the absence of Peter, when our Lord's question was put, and his return, before the disciples put theirs 464—467

General confirmation of this conclusion—Disputes among the disciples concerning precedence, not known to exist before the Transfiguration—Privilege of being present at the Transfiguration, restricted to three of the apostles distinct from the rest—Probable cause of the subsequent disputes, due to this distinction—Opinions or expectations of the disciples themselves, at this period of their history, nothing distinct from those of their age and nation—Probable influence of these opinions on the Twelve, from the time of their ordination, in comparison of the disciples in general, and on some of the Twelve, in comparison of the rest—Point in dispute among the apostles, who was, as much as who should be, greatest—Peter and the sons of Zebedee, why likely to be most forward in such disputes—Οἱ δώδεκα, applied to the Eleven in the absence of Peter, no objection—Observation of John on our Lord's address, an argument of Peter's absence—Exorcism and exorcists among the Jews—Eleazar, the exorcist, in the time of Vespasian—Testimonies to the belief in the reality of demoniacal possession, and to the existence of exorcists, anciently—Idiom of St. Matthew, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ—Approach of the disciples to the person of Jesus, not indiscriminate—Practice of our Lord to precede his disciples in public—Allegory of the shepherd in St. John—Inferential particle ἄρα, never superfluous 467—477

Distinctness of the several accounts further confirmed by the comparison of each with the other—No appearance of difference between them, but what is intelligible on the principle of a repetition soon after, of what had just before been said—A second discourse on humility and self-abasement, to parties addressed by a former, no objection to the above conclusion 477—481

DISSERTATION XXX.

On the supplementary relation of John vii—xi. 54. to the first three Gospels 482—516

Ἀδελφοὶ of Christ resident in Capernaum—Details of the Gospel of St. John resumed at vii. 1—Object of the present Dissertation to

- complete the argument in Dissertation xxiii—Antecedent probability of a supplementary provision in the last Gospel, for the three preceding, nowhere greater than here 482—483
- Time and place of the conversation between our Lord and his brethren—Answer of our Lord, how to be understood—Feast of Tabernacles, and middle day of the feast—Probable date of the departure of Jesus from Capernaum, and arrival at Jerusalem 483—485
- Three distinct days alone discoverable in the course of proceedings subsequently—Resort of Jesus to the temple at *πρωτῇ*—Mission of officers to apprehend Jesus, to what cause due, and when—Omission of Tisri 20, in the order of the accounts—*Ὑπηρέται*, or officers of the magistrates among the Jews—Peculiarity of the present attempt on the person of Jesus, and of the means by which it was defeated—Water libation on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles, and ceremonies with which it was accompanied—Women's court, our Lord's place of resort in the temple—Evening libation the more joyous of the two—General distribution of the proceedings, for the three days in question, Tisri 19, Tisri 20, and Tisri 21, from John vii. 14—viii. 1 485—492
- Proceedings of Tisri 22, John viii. 2—Tisri 22 a Sabbath—Woman taken in adultery—Morning service in the temple, and hour of *πρωτῇ*, and the resumption of our Lord's discourse, coincident—Discourse from that time to viii. 59, consecutive—Departure of Jesus from the temple, viii. 59 492—495
- Miracle on the blind man at the gate of the temple—Consecutive on the preceding events—Day of the miracle a Sabbath, but not the Sabbath—Date of the miracle, Tisri 22, Thursday, October 18—Julian as well as Jewish dates of the several days, from Tisri 10, Saturday October 6, to Tisri 22, Thursday October 18—Case of the woman taken in adultery, no objection to the day's being a Sabbath—Examination of the subject of the miracle before the sanhedrim—Interview of our Lord with him afterwards—Regularity of the account from viii. 59—ix. 35—end. 495—499
- Reasons for supposing proceedings at the feast of Tabernacles continued, John x. 1—21—Hearers of our Lord at the Encænïa, might be the same as at the feast of Tabernacles preceding—Probable origin of the question in Solomon's porch—Opinions and expect-

tations of the men of the time—Contrast between the words and the actions of our Lord—Metaphor of the bread which came down from heaven—Metaphor of the living water—Allegory of the good shepherd, and perplexity occasioned by it 499—507

Interval between the feast of Tabernacles and feast of Dedication, probably spent at Capernaum in Galilee—Resumption of the account at the feast of Dedication—Date of the feast of Dedication, Dec. 19—Dec. 26—Coincidence of it with the depth of a Jewish winter—Proceedings at the feast, not more than one day in length 508—510

Retirement of Jesus to Bethabara—Τὸ πρῶτον, in reference to the ministry of John—Bethabara, the Aulon or Perichorus of Jordan—Fords of that name over the Jordan—Various reading of Bethany beyond Jordan—Probable distance of Bethabara or Bethany from Jerusalem 510—513

Length of the residence at Bethabara—Sickness of Lazarus, and interval between the commencement of it, and our Lord's return to Jerusalem—Sickness of Lazarus, probably a fever—Seven days of mourning among the Jews, and entertainment during them of the friends of the dead—Raising of Lazarus—Probable reason why Jesus remained two days at Bethabara after hearing of the sickness of Lazarus—Design of the Pharisees upon the life of Jesus—Retirement of Jesus to Ephraim—Site of Ephraim 513—516

DISSERTATION XXXI.

On the supplementary relation of Luke ix. 51—xviii. 14. to the first two Gospels 517—544

Point of time, up to which the Gospel of St. Luke accompanies that of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and where it rejoins them again—Evidences in the intermediate period, of our Lord's journeying, and journeying in the direction of Jerusalem—Visits to Jerusalem in the last six months of his ministry, to which these indications can refer, none of them applicable to the circumstances of the journey, but the last. 517—519

Reasons, why the indications in question should be referred to that visit, and to none else—Period in the course of our Lord's ministry intimated by the notice premised at Luke ix. 51—Meaning of

- the phrase, *ἡμέραι τῆς ἀναλήψεως*—Meaning of the phrase, *στηρίξαι τὸ πρόσωπον*—Jesus preparing to pass through Samaria, on this occasion, was previously in Judæa—Mission of the Seventy later than this passage, and yet from Capernaum in Galilee—Confirmation of the same presumption by St. Matthew and St. Mark—Passage through Samaria, out of Judæa, in question, a journey from Ephraim, where St. John's Gospel last left Jesus—Advantages of this supposition to connect and explain all the evangelical accounts—Answer to the objection to it, that the *face* of Jesus, in his passage through Samaria, was *going* to Jerusalem—Intended of the final end of the passage itself, not of the direction of the journey at the time 519—529
- Length of the residence at Ephraim, and time of the return into Galilee—Mission of the Seventy—Fourth and last circuit of Jesus—Began in Galilee, and consequently at Capernaum—Confirmation of both these conclusions by the proceedings on the morning of the crucifixion—*ὧδε* in the New Testament, an adverb of place—Last progress of our Lord to Jerusalem known to have begun in Galilee, before it ended in Jerusalem—Outward characteristics of that progress, and why so distinguished 529—534
- Seventy, why dispatched in companies of two and two—Probable duration of their absence—First proof that our Lord was actually on his progress after their return, the incident in the house of Martha—Internal evidences from that time, to the time of the arrival in Judæa, Luke x. 38 to xviii. 14, inclusive, which confirm the above conclusions 534—540
- Point of time where the three accounts coincide, and begin to accompany each other—Omission of the intermediate six months in St. Matthew and St. Mark—Resumption of the thread of their accounts with the passage of Jesus into Peræa—Time of this passage in St. Matthew and St. Mark, and its place in the accounts of St. Luke—Judæa, beyond Jordan—Plain of Jericho—Road from the Jordan to Jerusalem—Point of time when Jesus was now in Judæa—Question relating to divorce—Parable of the labourers—Jesus in Peræa, on the morning of the day when he stopped with Zacchæus 540—544

DISSERTATION XXXII.

On the village of Martha and Mary 545—579

Scene of the incident in question, not the village of Bethany, but some village in Galilee—Rule of the Gospels with respect to the names of places in the evangelical history 545—546

Grounds of the contrary persuasion, that Martha and Mary were natives of Bethany—Repugnant to antecedent probability—Disproved by the testimony of St. John—Idiom of St. John in the use of ἀπὸ, to describe an inhabitant, and ἐκ, to describe a native of a particular place, illustrated by cases in point—Opinions of the Jews in the time of Justin Martyr, with respect to the locality of the appearance of the Christ—City of Philip, and of Andrew and Peter, respectively 546—551

Application of this criterion to the description of the family of Lazarus, John xi. 1—Reference in the Gospel of St. John, to this account of the village of Martha and Mary in St. Luke—Answer supplied by the account of the unction at Bethany, to the question, How any part of the family of Lazarus might be natives of Galilee, but living in Bethany—Unction at Bethany, intended out of gratitude for the miracle on Lazarus—Unction at Bethany, distinct from the unction at Nain—Martha, the mistress of the house in which the unction took place, yet Simon the master—Martha, probably the wife of Simon—Traditionary relationship of Simon to Lazarus—Simon, probably the subject of a miracle of our Saviour's—Martha, though the wife of Simon, might have possessions of her own in Galilee—Jewish law on the subject of inheritances—Motions of the family of Lazarus after the miracle upon him, to the last passover 551—555

General observations on the preceding account—No reason to expect the name of Lazarus would be mentioned by St. Luke—Proof in the above incident, that Jesus was now on his last circuit. 556

Circumstances peculiar to the unction at Bethany—Content of the alabaster vase—full of unguent—Alabaster vases the common receptacles of unguents—Shape of the alabaster vase—Unguents also kept in shells—Illustrations from classical authors of all these things 556—559

Price of the unguent—*Μύρον νάρδιον*—Syrians, or Syrophœnicians, the dealers in unguents—Unguent of nard the most esteemed of Syrian unguents—Value of the spikenard unprepared—Examples of the prices of unguents of various kinds—Balm of Gilead or balsam—*Malobathrum*—Sauce of the scombri, or *garum* 559—562

Νάρδος πιστική—Supposed derivation of *πιστικός* from *πιστός*, and *πιστός* from *πίω*, *potare facio*—*Liquid*, the characteristic of unguent of every kind—*Μύρα* as such, composed of oils and aromata—Potable nard, a nonentity—Mixture of *μύρα* with wines—Administration of *μύρα* in medicine 563—566

Probable derivation of the epithet of *πιστικός*—Part of the nard used in the making of unguent, more especially the leaves and stalks—Trituration or bruising, the means resorted to extract the essential oil—Themes in the Greek language, which, though obsolete themselves, survive in their derivatives—*Πίσσω*, to pound, an ancient theme of this description—*Pinso* or *piso* in Latin—*Πιστικός* regularly derived from *πίσσω*, to describe nard fit for pounding, that is, for the making of oil of nard 566—569

Μύρον unknown in the Greek language before the time of Archilochus—Use of *μύρα* in the East—Application of *μύρα* to the feet—Use of *μύρα*, originally regarded as effeminate—Passionate fondness of the Romans of later times for the luxury in question—Various modes of the application of it generally—Examples from the Greek and Latin classics, in illustration of these things 569—576

Use of unguents or aromata, among the Jews—Use of perfumes, or aromata and unguents, at funerals—Examples in illustration of it—Language of our Lord in reference to the act of Mary, founded upon this use 576—579

DISSERTATION XXXIII.

On the two dispossessions, and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost : or the comparison of Matt. xii. 22—45. with Luke xi. 14—36 580—614

Distinction of these two occasions not liable to the objection of antecedent improbability—Miracles of dispossession alone liable to the charge in question, and miracles of dispossession among the commonest of our Saviour's miracles 580—581

Demand of a sign, not restricted to the present occasion—Demand of a sign by the Jews, in after-time—Signs of the false prophets, in after-time—Signs which attested the Divine legation of Moses—Sign, to precede the second advent of the Son of man. . 581—583

Direct inconsistencies between the two accounts, which result from considering them as the same—Not one individuating and identical mark of agreement in the two accounts, when compared together: whether I. the time: or II. the place: or III. the subject of the miracle: or IV. the cause of the discourse, and the parties concerned in the cause, and addressed by the discourse: or V. the order, substance, and particulars of the discourse in each: or VI. the circumstances which follow on the discourse in each 583—608

Double insinuation on the present occasion, and distinct bearing of each—Blasphemy of the Spirit, as opposed to blasphemy of the Son of man—Conversion of phrases, *ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ* and *ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ*—*δάκτυλος*, *χεὶρ*, or *βραχίον* of God, descriptive of what—Miracle of the resurrection, as opposed to the miracles of our Lord in general, and reasoning of our Lord with reference to each—Language of Jesus, in the personal apostrophe to the Scribes and Pharisees—Allegory of the unclean spirit, dispossessed, and seeking rest, and finding none—Applicable to the continued perseverance of the Jews in their infidelity, until the means of conviction should be withdrawn from them. 591—606

Further objections to the supposition that the accounts are identical 608—609

Answer to the question, What was the sin against the Holy Ghost, supplied by the above account—Sin against the Holy Ghost, the sin on this occasion committed—Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and sin against the Holy Ghost, to be distinguished—Sin on this occasion committed, a sin of words, and blasphemy essentially a sin of words—Proper or classical sense of blasphemy, *slander*, or *injurious aspersion*—The Supreme Being himself may be the object of injurious or evil speaking—Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost in this sense, strictly sin against the Holy Ghost—Sin after baptism, though sin against grace, not sin against the Holy Ghost in this sense—Sin unto death in St. John, may be sin against the Holy Ghost in this sense—Rule of the construction of human penal

statutes, in the literal sense, applicable to the denunciation of the unpardonable nature of this sin in particular—Literal sense of the sin in question, blasphemy or slander, and nothing else—Reference of the sin or blasphemy in question, to the scoffers on the day of Pentecost, objectionable on many accounts—Phrase τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, with the ellipsis of τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης—The blasphemy against our Lord in person, now committed, why a pardonable offence, but the blasphemy against the Spirit, at the same time, not 609—614

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

DISSERTATIONS.

DISSERTATION XV.

On the prophecy of the Seventy weeks, and the first part of the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles.

I. ΚΑΤΑ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου, χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν. Rom. xvi. 25, 26. By revelation of a mystery, (*that is, a secret,*) which for an eternity of time was concealed, but hath been made manifest now, and by means of prophetical scriptures.

II. Περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν καὶ ἐξηρεύνησαν προφηται· οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες· ἐρευνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ—1 Pet. i. 10, 11. Concerning which salvation prophets have inquired and searched out; *to wit,* they who have prophesied concerning the grace which hath been shewn unto you; searching it out against what season, or juncture of circumstances, the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, was making *such things* known.

III. Ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, ἐφάνερωσε δὲ καιροῖς ἰδίους—Tit. i. 2, 3. In hope of everlasting life, which God, who cannot lie, promised an eternity of time ago; but hath manifested in its own seasons.

IV. Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων· τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίους—1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a redemption-price for all men; to be the testimony of its own seasons; (*that is, which should be testified of, or preached and attested, in its own season.*)

V. Προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων—1 Pet. i. 20. Preordained, indeed, before the foundation of the world, but made manifest in the last times.

VI. Νῦν δὲ ἅπαξ, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ, πεφανέρωται—Heb. ix. 26. But now hath he once been manifested, for the doing away of sin by the sacrifice of himself, at the conclusion of the periods of ages.

VII. Πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντησεν—1 Cor. x. 11. For our instruction, upon whom the ends of the periods of ages are come.

VIII. Εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν—Ephes. i. 10. Against the dispensation of the fulness of the seasons; that is, the dispensation which should begin when its proper season was fully come.

IX. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξάπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ—Gal. iv. 4. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son.

In all these texts, the renderings of which I shall not stop to verify, the beginning of the Christian dispensation, strictly so called; which cannot be placed earlier than the time of the incarnation and birth of Christ; and every subsequent step in its progress, until the œconomy of the scheme of human redemption had been fully developed, and the saving truths of the Gospel had been published, without distinction, to the whole world: are spoken of as having each their proper season, by whatever name this season may be

called; their fixed and determinate period of being, before which they could not be antedated, and after which they could not be delayed: and in all of them this period is spoken of not as the result of any fatal necessity, but as the effect of his will and appointment, who was the Author of the scheme, and the Disposer of its progress from first to last—whose ways are known to himself from all eternity—and who in the consummation of his own purposes is the sovereign Controller of times and seasons, as well as of every thing else^a.

When therefore after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, our Lord came into Galilee, preaching, according to St. Mark^b, the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying: "Ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε, καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ": if he referred in these words to any period as fully arrived, he referred to it as fully arrived with the time of this very return; and if the time of this return was the date of the commencement of his own personal ministry, in any sense different from its beginning before, he referred to it as fully arrived with the commencement of that ministry also.

It follows, then, that the time when our Lord was to enter upon his own ministry, like the time of every other cardinal event in the course of the same dispensation, was something already determined; which might be referred to accordingly: and if it were to be referred to, as it is here, in the midst of a public address, and as part of the discharge of a public commission, which would be referred to as something determinate not only in the counsels of the Divine Providence, but in the apprehension of the hearers likewise. In other words, it must be referred to as matter

^a Acts i. 7.^b i. 14, 15.

of prophecy ; which our Lord's appearance at this very time, in the performance of a certain duty, would of itself be supposed to fulfil. It follows, therefore, that the time of his appearance, in the proper discharge of his personal ministry, was something preordained by prophecy ; and consequently by *chronological* prophecy, or prophecy expressly designed to fix times and seasons ; but with an implicit reference to the Christ himself.

Now this design and this reference are both manifestly true of the prophecy of the Seventy weeks ; but perhaps of no other prophecy (relating to the advent of the Messiah) in the Old Testament besides. We may infer, then, that whatever other purposes that prophecy might be intended to serve, the business of fixing the time for the public manifestation of the Messiah would necessarily be one. This public manifestation cannot be dated earlier than the commencement of the ministry of John, nor later than the commencement of the ministry of Christ ; and consequently the period fixed before for the manifestation itself must be terminated by one or the other of these extremes, or what is equally possible be included between each.

And as the beginning of the manifestation was thus expressly predetermined by prophecy, so, as it is to be presumed, was its continuance also. In other words, it had been equally fixed and limited at each of its extremes. The absurdity of a contrary supposition is too palpable to require any proof. The personal ministry both of the Baptist and of our Saviour, respectively, conspired to one result ; with the nature of which it was just as inconsistent that it should not have a proper ending, as that it should not have a proper beginning. Nor is it agreeable to the analogy of prophecy in general to find that so many minute, circumstantial

facts in our Lord's history have all been expressly predicted; while such important particulars as the precise commencement, and the precise termination, and consequently the exact intermediate duration of his personal ministry, have been passed over in silence. But indeed St. John's idiomatic expressions, His hour was not yet come, while the period of his suffering was still distant; and His hour was come, when the time of his departure from the world, and of his return to the Father was at hand: as well as many passages in his own discourses, which might be pointed out^c, place it beyond a question that the close of our Lord's ministry, and therefore its duration, were always as fixed and as determinate as its beginning.

The memorable prophecy, which is recorded in Daniel ix. 24 to the end of the chapter, is commonly called and considered the prophecy of the Seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years; but if this denomination has been given to it, on the implicit assumption that this number of weeks, or the corresponding number of years, expresses the absolute scope of the prophecy, or the whole length of time embraced by it; there is reasonable ground to doubt of the propriety of the designation. The two extreme events which it mentions are the going forth of some commandment to return, or to restore and to build Jerusalem, and the consummation of some desolation determined on; the first of which events, as all commentators are agreed, refers either to the decree of Cyrus given to Zerubbabel, or to the decree of Artaxerxes given to Ezra, or to the decree of Artaxerxes given to Nehemiah^d; and the last, as they are equally

^c John vii. 30. viii. 20. xi. 9. xii. 23. 27. xiii. 1. xvi. 16—22. 28. 32. xvii. 1. Matt. xxvi. 45. Mark xiv. 41. Luke xii. 49, 50. xxii. 53. ^d 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23. Ezra i. 1—4. vii. 11—26. Nehem. ii. 7, 8.

agreed, can be understood of nothing but the Jewish war; its beginning, effects, and conclusion. Between the latest of the former decrees, and the time of the beginning only, and not the conclusion of this war; there was a period of five hundred and nine years, not of four hundred and ninety. Unless, therefore, it can first be shewn that the prophecy admits of a double ἀρχή or point of commencement, from each of which the same number of years was designed to begin and to proceed alike; the period of seventy weeks alone cannot be considered to define the utmost extent of its continuity, nor to be exactly commensurate with the scope of the prophecy, from first to last.

If we examine the structure of the original; the first observation, which forces itself upon us, is the distinction perceptible between verse the twenty-fourth and the remainder of the prediction. The former is clearly a summary or general statement of the purposes of the prediction; the latter is their particular exposition: the latter, therefore, as it is reasonable to presume, explains the former; that is, it defines and ascertains the general statement by the details of the more particular. Now it is far from uncommon in any language, and still less so in the language of the ancient scriptures, especially in the case of general statements relating to numbers; where a whole number and a part are both to be expressed, and the part is small or insignificant in comparison of the whole, to find the fraction of the number dropped, and the whole number only put in round terms for both.

The Sanhedrim of the Jews consisted of seventy-two, or at least of seventy-one members^e, and yet they are always called the Seventy; the elders mentioned in the book of Numbers, and the ancients of the house

^e Mishna, iv. 214. 6. Maimonides, De Apparatu Templi, iv. 15.

of Israel, in Ezekiel^h, are spoken of as seventy, and yet were most probably seventy-two; the translators of the Pentateuch into Greek were composed of six persons from every tribe, and yet they are never known except as the Seventy*. The disciples sent out by our Lord are currently believed to have been seventy-two†, yet they are spoken of, in St. Lukeⁱ, as seventy: and it is not less probable that the seventy judges, mentioned by Josephus^k, and each time clearly in imitation of the Sanhedrim, were in reality the same in number.

On this principle also it is that the reign of David, which was actually a reign of forty years and six months, is called one of forty years in the very passage which proves it to have lasted six months longer^l; and that the building of the temple, which was begun by Solomon in the fourth year of his reign and in the month Zif, the second in the sacred year, and was finished in the eleventh year of his reign, and in the month Bul, the eighth in the sacred year; and consequently occupied either six years and six months only, or seven years and six months in all; is said to have taken up seven years^m: and that Josephus, a Jewish historian, so often puts the nearest whole number for

* Ἐξ ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἥδη πρεσβυτέρους πέμψας, says Josephus in relation to them; and directly after; καὶ τοὺς ἐβδομήκοντα τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐλλυθόταςⁿ. In like manner Philo Judæus: φυλαὶ μὲν γάρ εἰσι τὸ ἔθνος δώδεκα . . . γενάρχαι δὲ τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους ἐβδομήκοντα γέ-

γόνασιν^o.

† Vide Origen, Operum ii. 380. E. i. 806. C. 828. E—PP. Apostolici, 409. C. Recognitiones Clementis, i. 40—Epiphanius, Operum i. 50. C. D. Herodiani, iv—Augustin, Operum iii. Pars ii^a. 254. Quæstiones Evangeliorum, i. xiv.

^h Numb. xi. 16—30. Ezek. viii. 11. ⁱ x. 1. ^k Bell. Jud. ii. xx. 5. ^l 2 Sam. v. 4, 5. ^m 1 Kings vi. i. 37. 38. 2 Chron. iii. 2. v. 2, 3. vii. 8—10. ⁿ Ant. Jud. xii. ii. 5. 6. 11. ^o Operum ii. 111. l. 2—6. De Mose.

the same number and part of another ; calling, for instance, the reign of Archelaus, which was one of nine years and some few months, a reign of nine years only ; and the reign of Herod Agrippa, which was one of six years and part of a seventh, a reign of six years only.

On the same principle, then, it would be nothing extraordinary, if, in such a general statement of the purposes of the period in question as is given Dan. ix. 24, seventy weeks alone should be specified, though seventy weeks and an half were meant ; provided that, from the particular exposition, which follows, the real number of its weeks were safely to be collected. And this, as it must be evident, is actually the case. For from verse the twenty-fifth to verse the twenty-seventh, we meet with the distinct and successive mention, first, of a period of *seven* weeks ; secondly, of a period of *sixty-two* weeks ; thirdly, of a period of *one* week ; and fourthly, of a period of *half* a week ; which make up collectively a period of *seventy* entire weeks, and *one* half of a week : and in this distinction and succession of the parts, we possess, if I am not mistaken, the clue to the interpretation of the whole.

For first ; whatever reason may be assigned for the separate mention of seven weeks, and of sixty and two weeks, (concerning which I may have something to say hereafter ;) no good reason can be assigned why, both together, they should not be considered to make up a continuous period of sixty-nine weeks. By this means, the above four divisions become reduced to three ; upon which in common we may observe, that it is peculiar to each to find it insisting upon that circumstance in particular, which was to happen at the end of it : first, at the close of the sixty-nine weeks—dated from the going forth of some commandment—

upon Messiah the Prince ; and after the same sixty and nine weeks, on the cutting off of Messiah the Prince. It is a natural and an obvious sense of the first of these intimations, to understand it of the coming or appearance of the Messiah ; and of the latter, it is a still more obvious sense to understand it of his death. They are both, it is true, placed after the sixty and nine weeks, dated as above mentioned ; but the former only is placed directly at their close ; the latter not necessarily so. The truth of the prediction then might require that the coming or appearance of the Messiah should coincide with no point of time earlier or later than the expiration of the sixty-nine weeks ; but the same truth would not require that he should be cut off at the same time. Nor, indeed, unless both the coming and the cutting off in question were to be synchronous ; that is, unless the death of the Messiah, without any conceivable interval, was to ensue immediately upon his manifestation ; was it, in the nature of things, possible that both should happen at once ; not merely in a certain order of succession one after the other, as referred to a common point of time, but at the same point of time.

Secondly ; the first words of the twenty-seventh verse, being explained to mean, *And one week shall confirm, or, make good the covenant unto many ; and the half of a week shall put a stop to sacrifice and to meat-offering ;* the emphatic circumstance insisted on by the former will be the ceasing of the covenant to be made good or confirmed as before ; and the emphatic circumstance insisted on by the latter will be the cessation of sacrifice and of meat-offering ; each at the end of the specified time respectively.

Now with regard to this last purpose, or that which was to follow on the consummation of the half week ; it must have either a literal or a figurative significa-

tion. If it has a literal, it denotes the *actual* cessation of the legal sacrifices of every kind, both animal and vegetable alike; which are included collectively under the words of the original, *zebach* and *mincha**, sacrifice and meat-offering; but more especially the cessation of the daily sacrifice—the ἐνδελεχῆς θυσία—which according to the original appointment of the Law was made with such a *zebach*, and such a *mincha*, a lamb, and a meat-offeringⁿ; that is, with an omer of the finest flour, (which answers to five pints and upwards of our measure,) to accompany a lamb in particular, and a different quantity of the same, either more or less, with any other description of animal†^o. If it has a figurative signification, it denotes the *virtual* cessation of this sacrifice, in consequence of the sacrifice of the death of our Lord; the atoning virtue whereof being

* The word *zebach*, as the Lexicons shew, applies to every description of sacrifice, which could be made with a living animal, or be accompanied by the shedding of blood: the word *mincha*, on the other hand, to the mixture of fine flour, oil, and frankincense, which was required to go along with these. The word *zebach* then in its widest acceptation takes in all the animal sacrifices of the Law; and the words, *zebach* and *mincha*, take in not only these, but whatever else was requisite to their integrity. Hence, though the former term may sometimes be used specifically; viz. to oppose one description of the legal sacrifices (those of which the offerers partook) to another, as the burnt-offering, or holocaust, (which was en-

tirely to be consumed on the altar,) or as the sin-offering, (part of which only might be eaten;) still as used in its general sense, it comprehends them all; or if it is to be understood more particularly of any, it must be understood of that one kind and description of sacrifice which, while all the rest were extraordinary or occasional, was regular and perpetual; and this, though it might belong to the class of burnt-offerings or holocausts in general, was still the daily sacrifice in particular.

† Philo Judæus, ii. 250. l. 31. De animalibus sacrificio idoneis: σεμίδαλις γὰρ ἡ ἐνδελεχῆς θυσία ἐστὶν αὐτῶν, μέτρου ἱεροῦ τὸ δέκατον καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν· οὐδὲ τὸ μὲν ἡμῖσις πρωΐας, τὸ δὲ ἡμῖσις δείλης, προσάγεται, ταγηνισθὲν ἐν ἐλαίῳ, μηδενὸς εἰς βρῶσιν ὑπολειφθέντος.

ⁿ Exod. xxix. 38—42. Numb. xxviii. 3—6. Arbuthnot on Ancient Weights and Measures.

^o Cf. Ant. Jud. iii. ix. 4.

typified by the daily sacrifice, and by every other piacular sacrifice of the Law, the completion of the one was virtually at least the abrogation of the other. No other meaning, but one of these two, can be put on this declaration.

With regard, in like manner, to the preceding purpose, or that effect which was to ensue at the end of one week; if it can be shewn that, for seven years after the death of Jesus Christ, and the beginning of the propagation of the Gospel, it continued to be preached to the Jews alone; and at the end of this period, that it began to be preached to the Samaritans; and consequently that the privileges or promises of the ancient dispensation, as confirmed or realized by Christianity, were thenceforth no longer confined to the Jews: it will follow as a natural and obvious sense of the prophecy, that one week was exclusively employed in making good the covenant unto many. For no one, perhaps, will be disposed to deny that the covenant, intended here, may or rather must be understood of the original covenant either with Abraham, which is the more probable; or with Moses, which also may be meant: nor that the many, in whose behalf it was first and properly to be made good by the Gospel, are to be construed of what St. Paul denominates the *ἐκλογὴ*, or selected among the Jews^p; those whom our Saviour, in the language of parable, calls his own or his proper sheep, in opposition to his fold collectively^q; and of whom also Justin Martyr writes thus^r: Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ καὶ Σαμαρεῖς, ἔχοντες τὸν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν παραδοθέντα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀεὶ προσδοκῆσαντες τὸν Χριστὸν, παραγενόμενον ἡγνόησαν, πλὴν ὀλίγων τινῶν, οὓς προεῖπε τὸ ἅγιον προφητικὸν πνεῦμα, διὰ Ἡσαΐου, σωθῆσθαι.

^p Rom. ix. 6—13. 27. 29. xi. 1—10. 16—32.
26. 27.

^r Apologia prima, 79. l. 1—7.

^q John x. 3. 4. 8. 16.

In the former of these cases, or that which concerns the purposes of the half-week; the figurative sense may be shewn to be the true one, if it can be demonstrated that at no period of the Jewish history, and much less at any period within the scope of the prophecy, did an half-week exactly make the literal sacrifice and oblation to cease; whereas if the ministry of John Baptist began at a feast of Tabernacles, and our Lord's terminated at a passover, and there were actually three years and one half between; the description would be critically true of the effect of the half-week so included, and consummated by the death of our Lord.

In the latter of the same cases, or that which concerns the purposes of the one week; the truth of the assumption here also may likewise be shewn, if it is capable of proof that the first publication of the Gospel to the Jews began U.C. 783, immediately after the ascension of Christ; and its first publication to the Samaritans, that is, to any distinct from the Jews, began about the same time U.C. 790. And this also will be the case, if the Gospel began to be published to the Jews in the last half of the sixteenth of Tiberius, and to be preached to the Samaritans in the first half of the first of Caius.

It follows from these positions laid together, that the half-week and its purposes, though specified after the one week and its purposes, are to be altogether distinguished from them, and are altogether prior to and independent of them. The very necessity of the case, without any other consideration, forces this conclusion upon us: for unless such an explanation can be given to the making good of the covenant unto many, as will render it a different thing from the preaching of formal Christianity to the Jews; and at the same time such an exposition of the purposes of

the half-week, as will shew them to have been literally fulfilled in the event; and both in the relative order which they occupy in the prophecy, and both within the compass of time embraced by it: (which I will undertake to say is impossible :) then the one week and the half-week never could be devoted to a common purpose; never could follow each other in their present order; never could be coincident in any proportion together. It is the *whole* of the period of one week, which was to confirm or ratify the covenant unto many; and it is the *whole* of the period of the half-week, which was to make sacrifice and oblation, both *zebach* and *mincha*, to cease. The process should be going on for such and such a time, and for such and such a purpose in both; but the effect of the process, and the final attainment of the purpose, would appear only at the end of each.

Hence the cessation of the temple service in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; even though it had lasted three years and an half, instead of only three years exactly^s; must clearly be out of the question: for that was not the effect of any half-week's agency previously, nor devoted to any effect which was to come to pass within that length of time subsequently; or if it was, this was rather the *revival* than the *cessation* of any such effect as the perpetuity of the temple service.

The same remark is applicable to the suspension of the daily sacrifice of a bull and of two lambs; as instituted by the emperor Augustus^t, and continued until the middle of U. C. 819, in the twelfth of Nero^u. The regular temple service continued after that suspen-

^s 1 Macc. i. 54. 59. iv. 52. Jos. Ant. Jud. xii. v. 4. vii. 6. Cf. Hieronymus, Operum iii. 1133. *bis*, *ad princip.*
^t Philo, De Virtutibus, ii. 569. l. 8—13:
^u Jos. Bell. Jud. ii. x. 4. xvii. 2, 3.

sion ; which, as referred to the period of time embraced by the Jewish war, was the beginning, not the end nor the middle, of a certain week ; and besides, as it was the suspension of the offering instituted by a Gentile prince, and not of any part of the Mosaic ritual as such, it would be absurd to suppose that this is what the prophecy had in view. Nothing but a burnt-offering or holocaust, according to Maimonides, could be accepted from a Gentile worshipper^v; and the same passage of his writings asserts that a meat-offering or *mincha*, the other particular specified in the words of the prophecy, could not be received from him at all. But the import of the kind of sacrifice, described by *zebach*, applies to much more than a burnt-offering.

The actual cessation of the actual daily sacrifice, which took place on the seventeenth of the Jewish Thamuz, U. C. 823, not one month before the temple itself was burnt to the ground ; as referred to the same period of the Jewish war, happened neither at the *beginning*, nor at the *end*, nor yet at the *middle* of the week in question. For the war broke out, as we shall see hereafter, in the month Artemisius, Zif, or Jar, U. C. 819; from which time to the seventeenth of the month Panemus or Thamuz, U. C. 823, there were four years and two months complete ; and on the maxim of Jewish calculation, that *Unus dies in anno habetur pro anno integro*, there were even five years ; instead of merely three years and one half*.

* The true reason indeed, why the purposes of the half-week, though really prior in the order of time to those of the one week, are yet in the order of mention posterior to them ; appears to me to be this. The period of seven weeks and sixty

and two weeks, before which the Messiah was not to be revealed, and the period of one week, which was to make good the covenant with many after his appearance ; as referred to the main object of the prophecy, which I consider to be more

^v Maimonides, *De Ratione Sacrificiorum faciendorum*, iii. 2.

If we are right in these suppositions, the matter of fact, when we proceed to inquire into the fulfilment of the prophecy, ought to bear us out. Let it therefore be assumed that the time of the public and personal manifestation of the Messiah, either by his own preaching, or by that of his predecessor the Baptist, is the time marked out as the point where the first division of the prophecy, the sixty and nine weeks ; composed of seven weeks, and of sixty and two weeks ; (which I take it for granted are equivalent to four hundred and eighty-three solar or Julian years ;) was always intended to expire. This point, as we have seen, answers to U. C. 779, A. D. 26, the twelfth of Tiberius Cæsar *medio*, or the thirteenth *ineunte*. On this prin-

than any thing else this ratification in the Gospel of the promises of God to his chosen people ; are strictly consecutive periods, and strictly connected together ; defining both the time before which the dispensation of formal Christianity could not begin, and the time from which it was actually to proceed. The former of these was the time of the personal manifestation of the Messiah ; the latter was the time of his death. For this reason, perhaps, these two periods are specified in direct conjunction ; because the scope and design of the prophecy are, as it were, summed up in them both. The gradual preparation for the Christian scheme up to a certain point, and its final execution afterwards, are thereby exhibited in their natural order of correlation ; and are so much the more clearly expressed. The period which intervened between them, and which was taken up by the personal agency of the

Messiah, was interposed from the necessity of the case ; and was equally indispensable to either of them. The preparation for the Christian scheme could not be considered complete until the Messiah had actually appeared ; much less could its final execution begin until he had both died and risen again for mankind. His personal appearance, then, would be the close of the one ; and his death and resurrection the beginning of the other. The intervening period, devoted to his personal agency, whether longer or shorter in itself, would be something alike subservient to both ; and capable of being considered detached from each. As a period of preparation, not of execution, it partook of the nature of the sixty and nine weeks : as ending in the death and passion of the Christ, it laid the foundation of formal Christianity, and partook of the nature of the one week.

ciple, the four hundred and eighty-three years, having expired U. C. 779, A. D. 26, *ineunte* or *medio*, began U. C. 296, B. C. 458, *ineunte* or *medio* also.

Now, if the beginning of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus be placed where the most judicious chronologers are accustomed to place it; some time between December, B. C. 465, and December, B. C. 464^w; the year before Christ 458 coincided either wholly or in part with the seventh year of his reign; and the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes was the year in which Ezra arrived at Jerusalem^x; and the year of the mission of Ezra, which was the year of this arrival, is that point of time, from which, for reasons which have been often repeated, and on account of some considerations which I shall urge elsewhere^y, commentators in general either are agreed or would be obliged to deduce the commencement of the seventy weeks. The year of the mission of Zerubbabel, B. C. 536, would be much too early; and that of the mission of Nehemiah, B. C. 444, unless we were to run into the most unjustifiable shifts and expedients, would necessarily be as much too late; besides that the former was a commission properly to rebuild only the temple, and the latter was an auxiliary or supplementary mission, designed to cooperate with and give effect to that of Ezra.

Moreover, if Ezra vii. 7, 8, 9 be compared with Nehemiah i. 1. ii. 1, it will appear that the ninth, the first, the fourth or fifth months of the Jewish sacred year, all came within the compass of any one and the same year of the reigning monarch Artaxerxes. Consequently the reign of Artaxerxes began either where that year began; viz. in the month Nisan; or some-

^w Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, B. C. 465.
Dissertation xvi.

^x Ezra vii. 8.

^y Vide

where between its fourth and its ninth months; that is, in the autumnal quarter of the year. I consider this the more probable, because it is the more in unison with the historical fact that, between the commencement of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus and the death of his father Xerxes, there was an interval of seven or eight months, occupied by the reign of the usurper Artabanus^z. If Xerxes died about December, B. C. 465, the reign of Artaxerxes, seven or eight months after, might begin actually in the third or fourth month of the sacred year, B. C. 464. Nor would this be at variance with the assertion of Ezra quoted above; which is, not that he set out, but merely that he arrived in Jerusalem, in the seventh year of the king: for that would still be true though he had set out in the first month of the sacred year, and in the *sixth* year of the king, and arrived at Jerusalem only in the fifth month afterwards; provided that was after the beginning of the *seventh* of the king.

If so, the four hundred and eighty-three years began critically about the Scenopegia, B. C. 458, U. C. 296, and expired critically about the Scenopegia, A. D. 26, U. C. 779: that is, to the thirteenth of Tiberius *in-eunte*, when the ministry of John the Baptist began, from the time of the arrival of Ezra at Jerusalem in the first year of his mission, there were exactly four hundred and eighty-three years; sixty and nine weeks, or seven weeks and sixty and two weeks*.

* The coincidence is even more complete. It has been seen in Dissertation vii, that the paschal full moon, A. D. 26, fell upon March 21; and the feast of Tabernacles, consequent upon

that, began on September 14 or 15. The same, within one day, was the case, B. C. 458. There was an eclipse of the moon in that year on January 22, at 6. 30, in the evening. On the prin-

^z Eusebius, Chronicon Arm. Lat. Pars ii^a. 209.

As to the next period, there is no difficulty; for if John began his ministry, U.C. 779 *medio*, and our Lord

ciple consequently of the mean lunar motion, the moon was at the full again, for the meridian of Jerusalem, on March 22, at 10. 10, in the evening: whence, if the fifteenth of Nisan coincided with March 23, the fifteenth of Tisri would coincide with September 16.

On this subject there is another circumstance, which I will take the liberty of adverting to.

It might almost be collected from Ezra vii. 9. viii. 15. 31, that the twelfth of Nisan, in the year when he set out from the river of Ahava, was the first day of the week; and that the first of Nisan, after which there ensued a rest of three days' time until the fifth, was the fourth. Now if Nisan 15 coincided with March 23, this appears to have been actually the case. For between March 23, B. C. 458 *inclusive*, and March 23, A. D. 1 *exclusive*—the number of days, reckoned by the standard of the mean tropical year, is 167,280, and twenty-three hours, thirty-nine minutes, or another day and night over. These are equal to 23,897 weeks, two days.

Now A. D. 1, March 23, as I compute the days of the week, fell upon Friday: and this would be the case if B. C. 458, March 23 fell on the Wednesday; for then A. D. 1, March 21 would fall on the Wednesday, and March 23 on the Friday. If so, Nisan 15, B. C. 458, was a Wednesday; and therefore Nisan 1 was so too; and Nisan 5 and 12 were each a Sunday.

Moreover, Ab 1, the day when Ezra arrived at Jerusalem, on the same principle, was a Tuesday. For from Nisan 1 *exclusive*, to Ab 1 *inclusive*, the number of days is one hundred and eighteen, or sixteen weeks and six days over. Hence if Nisan 1 was Wednesday, Ab 1 was the day before Wednesday; viz. Tuesday.

Now after his arrival, viii. 32, 33, Ezra waited *three* days; and on the *fourth* such things were done, as shew that day to have been probably a sabbath. If Ab 1 was a Tuesday, Ab 5, the fourth day from that *exclusive*, was necessarily a Saturday.

I will add also, while I am upon this subject, that should it be conjectured from Ezra iii. 6. 5. 4, that the first day of Tisri, B. C. 536, in the year of the return from captivity, (when the ἐνδελεχισμός was renewed, and the temple service was first regularly begun,) was a sabbath—this may be proved to have been actually the case. According to Pingré, there was an eclipse of the moon April 13, at 9. 42 in the morning, for the meridian of Jerusalem, B. C. 536; which fixes the fifteenth of Nisan to that day, and by parity of consequence the fifteenth of Tisri to October 7 ensuing. If so, Tisri 1 coincided with September 23. Between September 23 *inclusive*, B. C. 536, and September 23 *exclusive*, A. D. 1, the number of days, estimated as before, is 195,769, and twenty-one hours, seventeen minutes over; that is, 27,967 weeks,

made an end of his at the passover, U.C. 783, there was exactly an half-week, or three years and one half, between these extremes.

With respect to the remaining period, or the period of the one week: that there was a determinate order in the propagation of the Gospel; that it was first to begin with Jerusalem and Judæa; then to be extended to Samaria; and lastly, but not until the last, to be also thrown open to the Gentiles: appears both from our Lord's declarations prior to the event^a, and from the matter of fact posterior to it. That there was likewise a determinate interval between each of these stages; and that this interval, in the first instance of all, was an interval of seven years' time; is what we are principally concerned with at present, and what we may endeavour to establish as follows.

The time when Christianity began to be preached to the Samaritans, and consequently the precise termination of the period for which it was exclusively confined to the Jews, cannot be placed either earlier or later than the date of the martyrdom of Stephen, and the time of the conversion of St. Paul. The time of that martyrdom coincided with the beginning of the persecution against the Church, which at this period was solely the Hebrew church; and both the preaching of the Gospel to the Samaritans, and the conversion of St. Paul, were events which arose directly out of the

and what may be considered one day of another. Hence if B.C. 536, September 23 fell on Saturday, A.D. 1, September 22 would fall on Saturday. A.D. 1 the tables exhibit September 22 on Thursday; which according to my reckoning would be

on Saturday. If so, B.C. 536, September 23 or Tisri 1 was a Saturday. The ἐνδελεισμὸς then was renewed and the temple service, after the return from captivity, began to proceed from and upon the sabbath.

^a Luke xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8.

persecution, and neither of them long after its commencement.

The Chronicon of Hippolytus the Theban, which, to whatever century after Christ it may itself belong, was doubtless compiled from much more ancient documents; contains among other notices of time the following^b: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους, καὶ τῆς ἀναλήψεως, ἄχρι τῆς τοῦ Στεφάνου λιθοβολίας, ἔτη ζ'. καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης, μέχρι τοῦ φανέντος τῷ Σαύλῳ φωτός, μῆνες ε': and this assertion, howsoever ascertained, I believe to be remarkably correct*.

For first; notwithstanding what some learned men have maintained to the contrary, it cannot, as it appears to me, be satisfactorily disproved, that at this

* The genuineness of this part of the Chronicon of Hippolytus the younger, is further ascertained by the following testimony of Theodore Metochita; Hist. Rom. p. 59.

Καὶ κατὰ τινὰς μὲν ἱστορικοὺς, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἰππόλυτον τὸν Θηβαῖον, ἐν-
αυτοὶ διήλθον ἑπτὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν
τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνάστασιν· καὶ ὁ πρωτο-
μάρτυς Στέφανος τὸ μακάριον τέλος
ἐδέξατο. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὥσεί μῆνες
διήλθον ἕξ, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Παύλου γέγονε
κλήσις.

It happens, however, that the antiquity of the opinion in question admits of being more strongly confirmed, by the Recognitiones Clementinæ; a work quoted by Origen, Operum ii. 20. F—22. A. Comm. in Gen. 14; and composed, most probably, sometime in the second century.

Patres Apostolici, 410. D. Recognitiones, i. 43: Verum cum frequenter super hoc rogarent, nos autem opportunum tempus

requireremus, *septimana* jam *una* ex passione Domini complebatur annorum: this was before the martyrdom of Stephen, and (cap. 44.) the week in question bears date from a passover. Cap. 53. to the end of the book, proves that it expired with the persecution begun by Saul. See also ix. 29: Ecce enim ex adventu justi et veri prophetæ, vix dum *septem anni* sunt.

Another passage shews that the ministry of our Lord was supposed to have begun in the spring; and most probably that of the year before the commencement of this week: Diffundebatur ergo per singula loca (*fama* sc.) adnuncians quod esset quidam in Judæa, qui sumpto a tempore veris exordio, regnum Dei evangelizaret Judæis: Liber i. 6. 400. C: cf. cap. 7. E. and Clementina Homilia i. 6, 7. and Clementina Epitome, De gestis Petri, 6, 7.

^b Hippolyti Opera, Appendix ad tom. 1^m. 46. *ad calcem*.

period of the Jewish history, and ever since the mission of the first Imperial Procurator, as Josephus expresses it—*ἡ γησόμενος Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσία*^c—and—*μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν*^d: the Sanhedrim, or supreme council among the Jews, if they before possessed the power of life and death under the reign of the Asmonean princes, and especially under that of Herod and Archelaus, had yet lost it under the Roman government. They retained, it is true, a degree of judicial authority; but not to such an extent as to inflict capital punishments. The situation of Judæa, after it had once been reduced to the form of a Roman province, was analogous to that of every other such province; in which Strabo, Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio, and every other historian who treats of or alludes to these, or to succeeding times, do all shew, in some way or other, that the lieutenants of Cæsar, or the representatives of the senate and of the people, and they alone, whether they were of consular or of prætorian or of simply equestrian dignity, without distinction, were invested with the power of the sword. The Talmud itself, greatly as it contends for the authority of the Sanhedrim in other respects, admits that this power had been taken from it forty years before the destruction of the second temple; that is, so early as U. C. 783, at the very time when, according to St. John, the members of that council themselves professed to Pilate^e, that it was not permitted them to put any one to death.

Nor is it any just ground of exception, that in some instances the Jewish authorities appear to have exercised such a power even after the period in question; for it is found, upon examination into the circumstances of the time, that these instances fall out between the demise of

^c Ant. Jud. xviii. i. 1.

^d Bell. ii. viii. 1.

^e xviii. 31.

one of the regular governors, and the appointment or the arrival of another: that is, they fall out exactly in an interval of anarchy; during which the turbulent spirit of the *peuple*, or the ambition of their rulers, who never could bear with patience this deprivation of their ancient privileges, was at liberty to resume them, at least for a season, with impunity. The death of St. James the Just, which was brought about by the contrivance of the younger Ananus, in the interregnum between the decease of Festus, and the arrival of Albinus^f, is one example of this fact; and the martyrdom of Stephen, if I am not much mistaken, will prove to be another.

For if we date the beginning of the propagation of the Gospel to the Jews, with the feast of Pentecost in the sixteenth of Tiberius, U.C. 783; seven years from that time bring us to the feast of Pentecost in the first of Caius, U.C. 790. Now, as we have seen elsewhere^g, Pilate was deposed by Vitellius some time in the first half of the twenty-third of Tiberius, or the latter half of U. C. 789; after which deposal Vitellius himself went to Jerusalem, and was there at the passover next ensuing, the passover of U. C. 790, celebrated that year on March 19^h: which being the case, that any such violent proceedings, as accompanied and followed on the death of Stephen, would begin while the president of Syria was in Jerusalem, and on the spot, is scarcely possible; and certainly is very incredible. But Vitellius, preparing to execute the commands of Tiberius against Aretas; which he received subsequently to this visit to Jerusalem; was again there at some feast after the passover: which the course of events, as we saw, demonstrated to be the Pentecost of the first of

^f Ant. Jud. xx. ix. 1.
332. Dissertation vii.

^g Vol. i. 347. 351. Dissertation ix.

^h Vol. i.

Caius, U. C. 790. On the fourth day subsequent to his arrival in the city; that is, on or about May 12^h: the news of the death of Tiberius was received; and the oath of allegiance, in behalf of his successor Caius, was administered to his subjects in Judæa: a fact which is attested by Philo as well as by Josephus¹.

Upon the second departure of Vitellius, which took place without further delay, the Jewish nation and the Jewish council were absolutely left to themselves. Pilate had been long deposed, and yet no successor had been appointed in his stead. At Rome, the kingdom of Judæa had been already conferred by Caius on Herod Agrippa; but Agrippa did not visit his dominions before the summer of the second of Caius, U. C. 791: and Maryllus, who was sent out before him^k, was sent out solely as Hipparchus; and consequently with no civil jurisdiction whatever*. It must be acknowledged, then, that no juncture of circumstances could be more favourable for the eruption of the national hatred against the Christian church at Jerusalem; or as the enemies of that church considered it, against the sect of the Nazarenesⁿ, in its daily increasing and flourishing state. The very fact that

* It may be collected from Dio¹, that the title of Hipparchus, as applied to some officer under the Roman emperors, describes one, whether appointed in Italy or elsewhere, who had subordinate officers under him, *ἐκ τε τῶν ὑπῆρων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐξελευθέρων* (*Kaísaros*); and was strictly the fiscal procurator; that is, had simply the charge of collecting the Imperial revenues^m; in which capacity he is expressly distinguish-

ed from both the civil and the military governors in any province. In such a relation, as it is most probable, did Maryllus stand to the Roman emperor, or, what is not an impossible supposition, even to the king of Judæa; being sent before him, not to administer justice, or to coerce the nation, but to look after the emperor's or the king's fiscal rights.

^h Vol. i. 332. Dissertation vii. 588. l. 10—14. De Virtutibus.

^m Dio, lvii. 23.

¹ Ant. xviii. v. 3. Philo, ii. 580. l. 20—28:

^k Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 10.

¹ lii. 25.

ⁿ Acts xxiv. 5.

Tiberius was now dead, but only just known to be so, might be the exciting cause of the violence itself; especially if there is any foundation in truth for the tradition elsewhere alleged^o, of his memorable rescript in favour of Christianity. The intentions of his successor might not yet be known; or if the tidings of the favours, which Caius had already conferred on Agrippa, had reached Judæa, this would tend rather to encourage, than to deter the execution of any designs against the obnoxious religion; for the whole conduct of Agrippa subsequently serves to shew that he was as bigoted to the ancient faith, and as inimically disposed towards Christianity as any of his subjects^p.

I will pause, therefore, here to anticipate an objection. Should it be said that the time, which we assign to the first seven chapters of the Acts, is more than enough for the transaction of intermediate events, between the commencement of the history, and the period of this attack upon the church; we may reply, first, that if these events are to be considered continuous, even the least possible supposition of the length of the time in question, that which should date the course of proceedings from the Pentecost of U. C. 786, in the nineteenth of Tiberius Cæsar, would still be more than sufficient to bring every thing to pass, before the Pentecost of U. C. 790, in the first of Caius. But if the events are not to be considered continuous, then there were hiatuses between them; and if there were hiatuses at all, they might be hiatuses of indefinite extent, and much more of such an extent as to fill up the period of seven years.

Secondly, there are evidently points in the course of

^o Vol. i. 444. 449. Dissertation xiii. xii. 1. 3.

^p Ant. Jud. xix. vi. 1. vii. 3. Acts

the narrative, at which intervals of greater or less extent between preceding and succeeding events may reasonably be supposed to exist; the particulars of which notwithstanding are nowhere given.

The first of these occurs at Acts ii. 42. The circumstances there related must have occupied some months dated from the day of Pentecost, when the Gospel began to be preached. That this feast therefore had long been over, at iii. 1—iv. 31, where the account of the miracle and of its consequences, the first particular which is next given in detail, begins and continues to be related, may be taken for granted; and yet that it was not the time of some other feast may also be inferred from iv. 16, 17: because among such as are supposed to have witnessed, and such as were likely to be impressed by, the miracle, none are there specified, except the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the people of the Jews in general.

A second period occurs iv. 32—37, and a third, at v. 12—16; of both which the same conclusion is even more evident than of the first. The last in particular must necessarily have embraced a considerable lapse of time; before the second attempt of the Sanhedrim to molest the further progress of the Gospel.

A fourth period occurs at v. 42, and vi. 1—6, which recounts the appointment, and the occasion of the appointment of the order of deacons. A fifth might intervene between vi. 7 and vi. 8; for the nature of the intermediate particulars would require some time; nor was it perhaps before the ordination of Stephen to the office of deacon, that by his eminent zeal and activity he rendered himself the most conspicuous, and the primary object of the ensuing persecution. This period, as I should conjecture, extended from at least the Pass-over to the Pentecost of U. C. 790.

That period, however, where the greatest lapse of time, with the least detail of particulars, may most reasonably be presumed to have intervened; is the period which immediately follows upon Acts v. 34—40. The nature of the advice then given by Gamaliel, and adopted by the council, supposes that the apostles thenceforward would be left to themselves. His reasoning was to this effect. If the project or attempt of the apostles was of men, it would come to nothing of itself, and therefore might safely be let alone; but if it was of God, nothing which the Sanhedrim could do would arrest its progress, or defeat its ultimate success. If Gamaliel was sincere when he gave this advice, and his colleagues were sincere when they resolved to act upon it; the suspension, at least for some time after, of all violence against Christianity would be matter of course. Before this period not less than one year, and very probably not less than two years, must have transpired; and after this period, which would thus coincide with U. C. 785, the latter half of the eighteenth of Tiberius, the attention of the Jews and of their rulers, as I have shewn elsewhere^q, was probably monopolized by other considerations which came more home to themselves: by Pilate's dedication of the shields, or sequestration of the Corban to construct an aqueduct, and by the increasing oppressiveness of his administration in general^r, which would be more and more felt, the longer it lasted.

All this time, as we may gather by implication from various passages^s, the Sadducees, and not the Pharisees, possessed the lead in the council. This is especially implied by v. 17: ἀναστὰς ὁ Ἀρχιερεὺς, καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων—The high

^q Vol. i. 449, 450. Dissertation xiii.
^s Acts iv. 1, 2. v. 17. 34.

^r Philo, ii. 590. l. 22—29. De Virtutibus.

priest, and all they of his party, the sect of the Sadducees *that then was*; the Sadducees *of the day*; the Sadducees *for the time being*: and that this high priest was still Caiaphas appears from v. 27, 28, compared with iv. 5, 6. 17: and that all were the same, who had put our Lord originally to death, seems to follow from their language itself—Ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching, and desire to bring *this man's blood upon us*.

All this is naturally accounted for if those, whom St. Luke describes as ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ*, were, as I understand the description, relations of the high priest. The expression properly denotes either persons of a family which were ἀρχιερεῖς, that is, heads of the courses of the priests; or those of a family which was akin to the high priesthood—which itself had produced high priests: and this last is a natural description of the kindred or family of Ananus the son of Seth, whose five sons†, Eleazar, Jonathan, Theophilus, Matthias, and Ananus, as well as himself, had been or were sometime high priests; and whose son-in-law Caiaphas, having been appointed high priest by Gratus about the twelfth of Tiberius‡, continued in office until he was removed by Vitellius in the twenty-third. Annas himself, whom Quirinius had appointed as early as U. C. 760§, continued to be the vicar of

* Among these persons, mention is made of John and Alexander, as well as of Annas and Caiaphas. The former was probably the same John, whose tomb is repeatedly alluded to by Josephus (Bell. Jud. v. vi. 2. vii. 3. ix. 2. vi. ii. 10.) as somewhere in the vicinity of the first

and outermost wall of the city; the latter was, perhaps, the Alexander mentioned in like manner (Bell. v. v. 3. and Ant. xviii. viii. 1.) as the father of Tiberius Alexander, (governor of Egypt at the time of the accession of Vespasian,) and the brother of Philo Judæus.

† Ant. Jud. xviii. ii. 2. iv. 3. v. 3. xix. vi. 4. xx. ix. 1.
‡ xviii. ii. 1.

§ xviii. ii. 2. iv. 3.

Caiaphas, even when he had been superseded by him ; and in point of precedence was scarcely to be distinguished from Caiaphas himself^w.

That each of them belonged to the sect of the Sadducees may justly, I think, be inferred from Ant. Jud. xx. ix. 1, where Josephus expressly asserts that Ananus the younger, the son of Annas ; (who, as we may suppose, only inherited the sentiments of his father ;) αἵρεσιν μετήει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων : as well as from the residue of the account. The purpose for which the fact is noticed ; viz. to explain the conduct of Ananus towards James, the brother of Christ ; and the similarity of the conduct of the high priest for the time being, at Acts vi. and vii. towards Stephen, render it exceedingly probable that not only some one of the Sadducees in general, but some one of the family of Ananus in particular, was now in office : and this would be the case any time between the removal of Caiaphas, at the passover in the last year of Tiberius, and the appointment of Simon, surnamed Cantheras, in the first or the second of Claudius^x.

That the martyrdom of Stephen synchronised with the time of some feast or other may almost necessarily be collected, from the mention of the Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and those of Cilicia and Asia, who are said to have stood up against him^y. All these, the Libertines themselves not excepted ; (of whom Suidas writes, Λιβερτῖνοι, ὄνομα ἔθνους—and whose appellation, as a nomen gentilitium, would be regularly derived from some such theme as Λίβερτα, Λιβέρτη, Λίβερτος, Λιβερτίνη, or the like, the very form of which almost vouches for its African original ;) were different classes of persons, inhabitants of different regions or cities ; the three first probably of the

^w John xviii. 13. 24.

^x Ant. Jud. xviii. iv. 3. xix. vi. 2.

^y Acts vi. 9.

Pentapolis of Libya or Africa, and of Egypt; the two last of Cilicia, and Asia Proper. The Libertinensis ecclesia, that is, the church of Libertina, or whatever was its proper name, is recognised among the African churches; and in the list of African bishops who met at the council of Carthage A. D. 411, upon occasion of the conference with the Donatists, the bishop of that church is enumerated*.

The language of St. Luke favours the supposition that the Libertines, Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, whom he associates together, had one synagogue in common; and those of Cilicia and Asia Proper, whom he opposes to them, had another. That there was a natural and an intimate connection between the Jews of Cyrene, and those of Alexandria, may be inferred from Jos. Ant. Jud. xiv. vii. 2, in the passage there quoted from Strabo. Nor was it any thing uncommon, for a number of contiguous regions to have one synagogue among them; of which usage I have had occasion to point out an instance, with reference to the Jews in the neighbourhood of Thessalonica^z. It is

* It seems a very unnatural and far-fetched explanation of the term Libertines, in the Acts, to derive it from the Latin, Libertus; (of which the proper version in Greek is ἀπελεύθερος;) and so to understand it of the descendants of Jews, settled in Rome or Italy, whose ancestors had been originally taken thither as slaves, but having sometime or other obtained their freedom, had acquired thereby the name of liberti for themselves, and of libertini for their posterity. No doubt there were many such at Rome, at this time. But why

should they be called *libertini*, if they were to all intents and purposes freemen of Rome, and had been so for many generations? Why should they not be called Romans, that is, Jews of Rome—just as others of the Dispersion, who lived in this or that country, or this or that city, were called after the city or the country? What connexion too could there be between the Libertine Jews of Rome, in particular, and these who are mentioned along with them, Jews of Cyrene and Alexandria, or even of Cilicia and Asia?

well known that the Jews of the Dispersion had each their proper synagogue at Jerusalem; and the number of such synagogues is stated at four hundred and eighty. But the owners of these synagogues, whether joint or single, would not be all assembled in Jerusalem together, except upon occasion of some one of the feasts; and that Pentecost, as well as any other solemnity, might bring them thither, is too obvious to require proof^a.

The time of some feast, as just past not long after the death of Stephen, is intimated also by the history of the Ethiopian eunuch^b. We are not concerned with the question who Candace, the queen of Ethiopia and mistress of this eunuch, might be; yet we have seen both from Strabo and from Dio^c, that there was such a person in U. C. 732, a woman of a manly spirit, with whom Petronius, the governor of Egypt, for some time waged a war. The Candace of the Acts might be her successor; for Ethiopia was by constitution subject to queens^d; and the name of Candace, like that of Abgarus among the Edessenes, or of Arsaces among the Parthians, or of Cæsar among the Romans, was transmitted along with the sceptre from one of them to another^{* e}. This eunuch of Candace's how-

* Œcumenius, in Acta Apostolorum viii. 27; i. 82. A. supposes Candace the usual name of the reigning king's mother, in Ethiopia. But the Candace of the Acts was the reigning queen, and so was the Candace of Strabo. The antiquity of the name of Candace, among the Indians or Ethiopians, would be illus-

trated, if it were true, as Suidas records, in Ἀλέξανδρος—that a Candace was reigning over the Indians in his time. Under the article Κανδάκη—this same queen is spoken of as the queen of the Æthiopians. Servius, ad Æneid. vi. 760: xii. 529: tells us the kings of Alba all took the name of Sylvius; of Latium, that of

^a Acts ii. 1—11. xx. 16. xxi. 27.

Dissertation v.

617.

^b viii. 27, 28.

^c Vol. i. 252—254.

^d Eusebius, E. H. ii. 1. 40. A. Cf. Strabo, xvii. 1. §. 54.

^e Pliny, H. N. vi. 35.

ever had been up to Jerusalem to worship; and was consequently returning home not long after one of the feasts.

That this feast was the feast of Pentecost, U. C. 790, may further be determined, at least presumptively, by the following argument.

In the second year of the emperor Nero, U. C. 809, as we shall see hereafter, St. Paul speaks of the high priest, who gave him letters to Damascus, as still alive^f: and that by this high priest here, he does not mean the same person who is called high priest at xxiii. 2, directly after, appears from Acts xxiii. 5, even later than the former reference. This high priest was certainly Ananias: and the only person who can be confounded with him was the Annas of the Gospels, or the Ananus of Josephus: between whom, and Ananias there are these two sufficient criteria of distinction; viz. that the former was Ananus the son of Sethus, the latter was Ananias the son of Nebedæus; the former, as I have endeavoured to prove, was a Sadducee; the latter, as it is shewn by St. Luke himself and even by St. Paul, was a Pharisee; and the sect of the Sadducees, which in the time of the former seemed exclusively to possess the lead in the public council, had now begun, in the time of the latter, to divide it with the sect of the Pharisees^g.

Now when Vitellius, at the passover, U. C. 790,

Murrhanus. The kings of Egypt were all called Pharaoh; of Philistia, Abimelech; of Syria, Benhadad; of Cilicia, Syennesis; of the Macedonian dynasty in Egypt, Ptolemy; of the same dynasty in Syria, Antiochus; of Arabia, Aretas; of Pergamus,

Philetærus; of Paphlagonia, Pylæmenes; of Bithynia, Nicomedes, &c. Vide Hieronymus, *Operum* iii. 902. *ad calcem*: Eckhel, *Doctrina Numm. Vett.* iv. 458: ii. 395, &c.: Strabo, xii. 3. §. 1. 45: 4. §. 2. 157.

^f Acts xxii. 5. ix. 1.

^g Acts xxiv. 15. xxiv. 1. xxiii. 6.

deposed Caiaphas from the priesthood, he appointed Jonathan, one of the sons of Ananus; and at the Pentecost in the same year, when he again deposed this Jonathan, he appointed his brother Theophilus in his stead^b. Let us suppose then, that either Jonathan or Theophilus gave Paul his letters to Damascus. Which ever of the two it was, he was alive in the second of Nero, when St. Paul came to Jerusalem. But Jonathan was not alive, as I shall shew more plainly hereafter, in the second of Nero, when St. Paul thus came to Jerusalem. It was not Jonathan then, but his brother Theophilus, who gave Paul the letters to Damascus. And this might very well be; for Theophilus having been made high priest, U. C. 790, continued high priest until U. C. 794 or U. C. 795; and whether high priest or not, in the second of Nero, yet if he was only alive then; (against which supposition there is no conceivable objection;) he would still be spoken of as such—as what he had been once, if not as what he still was. The usage of Josephus alone proves that those who had been high priests retained the title, even without the authority, of the office ever after: just as one, who had been prætor or consul among the Romans, was called Prætorius or Consularis, for the rest of his life. A younger brother of Theophilus was alive long after the second of Nero; and Jonathan, who seems to have been an older brother, had perished, and that by a violent death, only a little before.

The letters of St. Paul to Damascus, if given him by this Theophilus, could consequently not be given him before the Pentecost of U. C. 790. Nor, though we supposed they were so given him and in this year, would it be any objection to the truth of the suppo-

^b Ant. Jud. xviii. iv. 3. v. 3.

sition that, when St. Paul arrived at Cæsarea in the same year of Nero, and was on his way to Jerusalem, he found Philip the evangelist, whom the history in the Acts, after the baptism of the eunuch, had left there, still living in that place; but the father of four daughters, virgins and prophetessesⁱ. Before the baptism of the eunuch, or at least before the persecution which drove Philip to Samaria, he was certainly living in Jerusalem^k: and in all probability was unmarried. But though after that event, when he was finally left at Cæsarea, we were to presume that he settled there and even entered into the marriage estate; still between the first of Caius and the Pentecost of U.C. 790, and the second of Nero and the Pentecost of U.C. 809, there were nineteen years complete: within which it is manifestly possible that he might become the father of four daughters; the youngest of which might have more than attained to the age of puberty, by the time of St. Paul's arrival at Cæsarea*.

The comparative lateness of St. Paul's conversion, even as referred to the time of the martyrdom of Stephen, is further implied by this fact; that before it had yet taken place Christianity had reached Damascus. Now until the time of the persecution begun with the death of Stephen, Christianity, as we may take it for granted, had never been preached perhaps

* Caius the presbyter (apud Eusebium, E. H. iii. 31. 103. A.) speaks of these four daughters of Philip, as prophetesses, and as buried at Hierapolis in Phrygia. Polycrates, in his letter to Victor (Eusebius, E. H. iii. 31. 102. C. D. and v. 24. 191. C.) speaks of three daughters

of Philip as buried at Ephesus. It is most probable that these last were daughters, not of Philip the evangelist, but Philip the apostle; and so Polycrates in fact calls him. Cf. Rel. Sacræ, i. Annot. ad pag. 370. l. i. Philip the deacon and Philip the apostle are often confounded.

ⁱ Acts xxi. 8, 9. viii. 40.

^k vi. 5.

out of the precincts of Jerusalem; and certainly not beyond the precincts of Judæa. The texts, exhibited below¹, laid together appear to me demonstrative of this. Multitudes, it is true, and not of the native Jews, might be daily converted to the faith: but they were all converted in Jerusalem; they were all of the Jews of the Dispersion, or of those who, having previously become proselytes, were previously to be numbered among the people of Israel, whether at home or abroad. For the sake of preaching to such as these; all of whom spoke the languages of the countries where they had been born and bred; and that at the times of their annual visits to Jerusalem, it was that the gift of tongues was primarily intended, and would first be requisite. The apostles, indeed, considered collectively as Galilæans; whose dialect was certainly different from that of the inhabitants of Judæa; would want some such gift for the native Jews themselves: and hence it is that, among the great variety of tongues, which were heard on the day of Pentecost, in the act of being spoken by persons who were before known, or might be safely presumed, to be ignorant of them, the language of the dwellers in Judæa is specified as plainly as that of the most distant regions. In opposition, therefore, to the opinion of some commentators*, I should think that Acts i. 19, part of the speech of St. Peter to the rest of the disciples, all of whom were Galilæans as well as the Twelve, even prior to the gift of tongues; may justly be pronounced no parenthetical observation, proceeding from the pen

* Dr. Benson is one of those who argues from Acts i. 19, that the writer of the Acts was not a Jew. He should have said, not

a Jew of Judæa; but, if Judæa and Galilee had each a dialect of their own, he might still be a Jew of Galilee.

¹ Acts i. 8. ii. 39. iv. 16. 35. v. 16. 28. 42. vi. 1. 7. 9. 14. viii. 1. 4.

of the writer, but an actual sentence of the address of the speaker. Nor ought it to appear surprising that the dialect of Galilee, as such, differed more or less from the dialect of Judæa, if according to Strabo^m, even the Albanians, a single horde upon the Caspian sea, spoke twenty-six different dialects*.

Upon the commencement of the persecution, such as were separated from the mother-church travelled every where, preaching the Gospelⁿ; and among other places, they travelled as far as Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch^o; preaching however still to none but Jews; that is, as the context proves^p, to none but natives of Judæa, in opposition to Hellenists, or Jews born and bred among the Dispersion. This distinction was recognised at the very time of the institution of deacons; and as Damascus, in the first year of Caius, was subject to Aretas, an Arabian prince, and not to any native authority of Judæa, it is further implied by the commission of Saul. None but native Jews could be subject to the Sanhedrim in Damascus; or arrested there, by virtue of a power which *they* had given, in order to be brought for trial to Jerusalem.

Now if Christian evangelists had travelled to, and preached by this time in Antioch, they would much more have travelled to, and preached by the same time in Damascus; where many thousands of Jews were settled^q, and which was nearer to Judæa than Antioch.

* St. Peter's mode of speaking here, τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν is very like to that which Suidas employs, voce Ἐπικούρος, in giving an account of a law passed by the people of Lyctus in Crete, τῇ ἐπιχωρίῳ φωνῇ, as he says.

Now no one will suppose the Cretans did not speak Greek: and yet it was Greek not like that of the rest of the Greeks, but a peculiar dialect of their own in Greek.

^m xi. 4. §. 6. 427. 428.
Bell. Jud. ii. xx. 2.

ⁿ Acts viii. 4.

^o xi. 19.

^p xi. 20.

^q Jos.

It confirms this supposition, that Ananias, an inhabitant of that city, is spoken of at Acts xxii. 12, if not at ix. 10, clearly as a Jew; but, as it may be collected from ix. 13, as a Jew who had been only recently converted; or at least who had never been up to Jerusalem since his conversion, or since the death of Stephen, so as himself to have witnessed the conduct of Saul. The number of disciples, too, in Damascus could not yet be considerable, if, as it appears from Acts ix. 14, and xxii. 5, Saul expected to be able to bring them all bound from thence to Jerusalem.

In the account of the death of Stephen, Saul was called a young man: in his own Epistle to Philemon, he calls himself Paul the aged^r. The term *νεανίας*, or *adolescens*, among both the Greeks and the Romans, began to be properly applied at the age of thirty. If Paul was of this age in the first of Caius, U. C. 790, he would be at least fifty-three or fifty-four in the seventh of Nero, U. C. 814, when he wrote the Epistle to Philemon: and men began to be reputed *πρεσβύται*, or *πρεσβύτεροι*, that is, *senes*, at the age of fifty, as much as *νεανίαι*, or *adolescentes*, at the age of thirty*.

* Tradition makes St. Paul fifty-eight years old at the time of his martyrdom, U. C. 819: which agrees very well with the supposition of his age when he wrote the Epistle to Philemon.

In like manner, in the second of Nero his sister's son is called *νεανίας* also^s; the propriety of which appellation may be presumptively established as follows. If Paul was thirty, U. C. 790, his sister might be older, but probably was not much younger than twenty-eight or twenty-nine; and had she been

married at sixteen, she might have a son, twelve years old at the same time: which son, if he was twelve, U. C. 790, would be thirty or thirty-one, U. C. 809. St. Paul speaks of his *συγγενεῖς*, kinsmen at least, if not his cousins or his sister's sons; (the former of which would have been properly expressed by *ἀνεψιούς*, and the latter by *ἀδελφιδούς*;) as persons of mature age, and as long converted to Christianity, before the time of the Epistle to the Romans^t.

On this subject we may fur-

^r Acts vii. 58. Philem. 9.

^s Acts xxiii. 17. 18.

^t Rom. xvi. 7. 11. 21.

If then we suppose, with the *Chronicon* of Hippolytus, that St. Paul was converted six months after the martyrdom of Stephen, he would be converted about two months after the feast of Tabernacles U.C. 790: that is, after September 13^x. The first thing which he did after his conversion was to go into Arabia^y; where, probably, his subsequent acquaintance with the

ther subjoin the following remarks.

As St. Paul was a young man at the time of the martyrdom of Stephen; and as before his conversion to Christianity, we may take it for granted that he had not personally seen our Saviour, nor was possessed of any acquaintance with the facts of the Christian history; it is probable that he either came to Jerusalem from Tarsus upon this occasion, to attend the feast of Pentecost, or at the utmost had not been there long before his conversion, towards the end of the period between the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel, and the beginning of the first persecution in which he took so active a part. He declares, at Acts xxii. 3, that though born in Tarsus, he was brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel; and was there instructed in the principles of the sect of the Pharisees: and he repeats the declaration substantially at Acts xxvi. 4. 5, before Agrippa. Gamaliel was alive at Acts v. 34, which I have supposed was one or two years after the ascension: but how long afterwards is not certain. If he was the son of holy Symeon; Symeon was a very old man at the time of the

birth of our Saviour; and Gamaliel himself had a son called Symeon, who was of mature age in the first and second years of the^z Jewish war^z. Hence it is not probable that he long survived the council in the Acts: nor consequently that St. Paul's bringing up under him came between that council, and the persecution excited against Stephen. If so, it had taken place at an earlier period; and probably at one much earlier.

If I may advance a conjecture, which yet derives some support from the example of Josephus, as a parallel case^a, it would be when St. Paul was fourteen or fifteen years old, that he would either be taken or resort to Jerusalem, for the sake of perfecting his education as a Pharisee, under Gamaliel; and, until about the nineteenth or twentieth year of his age, that he would continue with him before he returned to Tarsus. In this case, no part of his residence in Jerusalem would coincide with either our Saviour's, or John the Baptist's, ministry; for, before the latter (and much more before the former) had been begun, St. Paul would have ceased to be resident in Judæa.

^x Vol. i. 332. Dissertation vii. ^y Gal. i. 17. ^z Vita Jos. 38. Bell. iv. iii. 6.
^a Vita, 2.

facts of the Christian history, as well as with the Christian doctrines; both which he declares to have been expressly revealed unto him; was so communicated: and then to return to Damascus. The length of his stay in Arabia might occupy the time until the arrival of the ensuing passover, April 7^x: and even in that case would be only of three or of four months' duration; on which account more especially, because it was inconsiderable in itself, and because it was not spent in teaching or preaching, but in learning as it were, and so preparing to preach Christianity, all mention of it may have been omitted in the Acts.

Three years after the return to Damascus^y, he went up to Jerusalem; evidently for the first time since his conversion, as the use of the term ἀνῆλθον, both here and in the seventeenth verse, meaning, I returned, not simply, I went up, of itself implies. If then he returned to Damascus about the passover, U. C. 791, April 7, he would go up to Jerusalem at this time, about the passover, U. C. 794, April 4^y. The length of the residence in that city previously, which is specified by himself at three years, is not contradicted by St. Luke, at Acts ix. 23, historically; for the expressions, And as many days were fulfilling, would bear, if necessary, the construction of more than that interval of time*.

The duration of this first visit to Jerusalem is stated as fifteen days†: and when St. Paul left it again, it

* There is exactly a similar mode of speaking, to describe the same interval of time, (*many days*, for three years.) I. K. ii. 38. 39.

that the shortness of the visit to Jerusalem, alluded to Gal. i. 18, is impliedly confirmed by Acts xxii. 18, which evidently refers to the same occasion.

† Dr. Paley justly observes

was to go into the parts of Syria and Cilicia^a; which circumstance of designation, agreeing critically with Acts ix. 30, shews that the visit to Jerusalem previously in both cases was the same; for in the one, Paul leaves Jerusalem to proceed to Tarsus, and in the other to go to Cilicia; which was in fact the same thing. And that he was conducted first down to Cæsarea, makes no difference; for Cæsarea might be considered to belong to Syria, within which province it was certainly included; or it was the intention of St. Paul to sail from Cæsarea to Antioch, or some other quarter of Syria; and to travel from thence to Cilicia. It is unnecessary therefore to understand the mention of Cæsarea here as of Cæsarea Philippi, and not of Cæsarea Augusta; though the former might be directly in the way by land to Tarsus.

The coincidence altogether is so far of importance, that the mention of the Hellenists, just before, which occurs in the Acts^b, and describes the Jews of the Dispersion, determines the time of the visit in the Acts to the recurrence of some feast; which might be, or rather must have been, the passover of U. C. 794. Nor is there any instance on record of St. Paul's visiting Jerusalem, after his conversion, except at the time of some feast: so that *a fortiori* it was to be expected that he would go thither—on this first occasion of all after that event—only at the time of some feast.

Now, at the period of this departure to Syria and to Tarsus, the churches throughout Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, it is said, εἶχον εἰρήνην; *were having*, or *enjoying peace*^c: nor can it, on any construction of these words, be inferred either that they were beginning to enjoy it only now, or had been in the enjoyment of it long: it can be inferred only that the persecution, begun at the death of Stephen, was over at

^a Gal. i. 18. 21.

^b ix. 29.

^c Acts ix. 31.

the time of this departure of Saul. But it was not over, as we have seen, until churches had been planted in Samaria and in Galilee, as well as in Judæa; and even in Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Antioch^d. The time of this rest will clearly coincide with the third year from St. Paul's conversion; that is with U. C. 793, and the last half of that year in particular; which is a most critical circumstance, and competent of itself to vouch for the accuracy of all our previous reasonings. For the time of the rest will coincide thereby with a memorable fact in the contemporary Jewish history; quite sufficient to have produced the rest in question, by drawing off the attention of the Jews from the Christians, exclusively to themselves: viz. with the attempt of the emperor Caius to erect his statue in the temple at Jerusalem; an attempt, which we have seen elsewhere^e, was begun about midsummer U. C. 793, in the last year of his reign; and the alarm and consternation, produced by which, continued until the spring of U. C. 794, in the first year of his successor.

Upon the accession of Claudius at this time, Herod Agrippa became invested with the same extent of dominion, as had been possessed by his grandfather Herod the Great; including also the tetrarchy of Abilene, which before had belonged to Lysanias^f. Now Damascus was contiguous to Abilene; and Abila itself was only eighteen Roman miles from Damascus; and that too, more to the north, and consequently further from Palestine^g. Hence there is every reason to suppose that the sovereignty of Damascus was included in the tetrarchy of Abilene; and consequently that from U. C. 794, the first of Claudius, Damascus would be subject

^d Acts xi. 19. ^e Vol. i. 295—301, 306—308. Dissertation vi. ^f Ant. Jud. xix. v. 1. Bell. ii. xi. 5. Dio, lx. 8. Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 10. Luke iii. 1. ^g Relandi Palæstina, iii. 527. Abila.

to Agrippa. But when St. Paul, at the end of his three years' residence there, made his escape from this city, the ethnarch of Aretas, it is said, was watching the city to lay hold on him; and in the history of his escape in the Acts, the Jews, it is said, were doing the same thing^h. We must infer, then, that the ethnarch was a Jewish officer; and that the title ethnarch was a general description for the ἄρχων τοῦ ἔθνους, the governor of the Jews of the Dispersion, wheresoever their numbers were sufficiently considerable to require one, or the Gentile authorities, to which they were subject, were otherwise disposed to allow of one.

Josephus cites a passage from Strabo, where he is speaking of the Jews at Alexandria in Egypt; whose case however is not to be considered a singular one; to the following effectⁱ: καθίσταται δὲ καὶ ἐθνάρχης αὐτῶν, ὃς διοικεῖ τε τὸ ἔθνος, καὶ διαιτᾷ κρίσεις, καὶ συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ προσταγμάτων, ὡς ἂν πολιτείας ἄρχων αὐτοτελοῦς. The same magistrate is called by the name of ethnarch, and the fact of his existence is recognised in the rescript of Claudius, addressed to the Alexandrians, and preserved by Josephus in another book of the Antiquities^k. Augustus permitted them even a senate, or sanhedrim of their own, elected by themselves, and consisting of a certain number of members, in all probability seventy or seventy-two*.

* Philo, Adversus Flacc. ii. 527.

44: τῆς γὰρ ἡμετέρας γερονσίας, ἣν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ εὐεργέτης Σεβαστὸς ἐπιμελησομένην τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν εἴλετο μετὰ τὴν τοῦ γενάρχου τελευτήν, διὰ τῶν πρὸς Μάγνον Μάξιμον ἐντολῶν μέλλοντα πάλιν (ἀπ') Αἰγύπτου καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐπιτροπεύειν, ὅκτω

καὶ τριάκοντα συλλαβὼν, κ', τ. λ.

Mangey, in his note on this passage, understands Julius Cæsar to be meant by the γενάρχης in question: which is undoubtedly a mistake. Egypt became a Roman province first U.C. 724, but Cæsar died U. C. 710: and

h 2 Cor. xi. 32. Acts ix. 23. 24. xvii. 1. 5. 12. 519. 520.

k xix. v. 2.

i Ant. Jud. xiv. vii. 2. Cf. Strabo

Thus Alexander, the brother of Philo Judæus, was ethnarch, or alabarch of the Jews in Alexandria^m; as also Demetrius, the husband of Mariamne sister of Agrippa the youngerⁿ. In like manner mention occurs in the history of the war of the ἄρχων of the Jews at Antioch^o. It is but consistent and natural that Damascus, where many thousands of Jews are known to have been resident, should have its ethnarch also; which ethnarch and his fellow-citizens, though Jews, when St. Paul made his escape from the city were subject to the government of Aretas.

Now Aretas was an Arabian prince; and the Arabian princes had no hereditary interest in Damascus, the previous history of which shews that it was properly subject only to the kings of Chalcis, or to the tetrarchs of Abilene. An Aretas was master of it in the time of Alexander Jannæus^p; but he had been invited by the Damascenes themselves, out of dislike to their preexisting governor, Ptolemy Mennæi, king of Chalcis^q; and then also it was speedily wrested either from him or

Maximus it is evident had been governor once, before the death of this γενάρχης, and was now appointed a second time, after it. Pliny, H. N. xxxvi. 14. §. 3, mentions a Maximus, as sometime præfect of Egypt; though not the reign in which he was so. I do not think it improbable that Maximus was actually in office when the Holy family fled into Egypt.

The truth is, the γενάρχης here is but another denomination for the ἐθνάρχης elsewhere: and in the case of Alexandria in particular, for the alabarch. Nor does the passage imply that though upon the death of this particular

ethnarch, (who might be the father of Philo himself,) Augustus allowed the Alexandrine Jews a senate or sanhedrim, they therefore ceased to have the usual ethnarch besides. The president of the sanhedrim would be the ethnarch. The passage of Philo in fact is illustrated by the rescript referred to in Josephus, Ant. xix. v. 2. The ethnarch in this last is the γενάρχης in the former.

The ethnarch of the Jews, as such, and apparently in Palestine or Syria, is referred to by Origen, Epistola ad Africanum, cap. 14: Operum i. 28. A: as an officer existing in his own time.

^m Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 3. viii. 1. xix. v. 1. xx. v. 2. ⁿ xx. vii. 3. ^o vii. iii. 3. ^p Ant. Jud. xiii. xv. 2. Bell. i. iv. 8. ^q Ant. xiv. vii. 4.

from Ptolemy, (who in that case must have recovered it again,) by queen Alexandra^r. After this, and before even U.C. 691, when Pompey put an end to the war with Mithridates, Damascus is seen to have passed into the hands of the Romans: and for a long time subsequently it appears to have been subject to them, and accounted part of the province of Syria*.

When Ptolemy however died, about U.C. 714, he was succeeded by a son called Lysanias^s; and though this Lysanias was put to death by Mark Antony to gratify the ambition of Cleopatra^{t†}, yet we have seen elsewhere^u that his tetrarchy was bestowed not many years after by Augustus Cæsar on Herod the Great; with whom it continued until his death: and Damascus at that time seems to have been attached to this tetrarchy, or rendered someway dependent on it^v.

After the death of Herod, it is true, we lose sight in a great measure of the history of Damascus. It is stated indeed that, at the partition of his dominions, a portion of what is called the οἶκος τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου was awarded by Augustus to the tetrarch Philip^x: but if this is a description of the tetrarchy of Lysanias, even this implies that the remainder of it was given to some one else[†]. The parallel place in the War^y, however, unless the text is corrupt, throws some doubt upon this construction.

Afterwards the tetrarchy of Lysanias, it is said, was

* Cf. Jos. Ant. Jud. xiv. ii. 3. Bell. i. vi. 2.

† At Damascus, as it would seem. See Bell. i. xviii. 5.

‡ Strabo, writing U.C. 770 or 771, (xvi. 2. §. 10. p. 318,) speaks of Chalcis and the ὀρευνή of the Ityræi as even then sub-

ject to Ptolemy Mennæi: and as this could be true at that time, only of some one of his descendants, perhaps it implies that this portion of his dominions was still in possession of his family; probably of a grandson, the Lysanias of St. Luke.

^r Bell. i. v. 3. Ant. xiii. xvi. 3.

^t Ant. xv. iv. 1. ^u Vol. i. 525. Dissertation xiv.

Vide also xxi. 11.

^x Ant. xvii. xi. 4.

^s Ant. xiv. xiii. 3. Bell. i. xiii. 1.

^v Ant. xv. x. 1. Bell. i. xxi. 4.

^y ii. vi. 3.

bestowed by Caius on Agrippa, when he first gave him the tetrarchy of Philip^z: but this must be an inaccurate statement; for the same gift, it is again said, was made by Claudius four years later^a: or if any part of the dominions of Lysanias was actually given by Caius to Agrippa, it is probable it was only that fraction of it, which had before been possessed by his uncle Philip. There is no reason at least to suppose that Damascus was included in any such donation. The tetrarchy, which is said to have belonged to Lysanias, was bestowed by Claudius, in the twelfth or thirteenth year of his reign, on Agrippa the younger^b.

The coins of Damascus, still in existence, are of no assistance upon this question: they are all coins of Augustus, Tiberius, and Nero, &c; but not of Claudius^c: and all either too early or too late for our purpose. About the seventeenth year of Tiberius, as it will be shewn elsewhere^d, it appears to have been still incorporated with the Roman province of Syria^e: and whensoever it passed into the hands of Aretas, it was after that time at least.

Whether the war, which was waged between Aretas and the tetrarch of Galilee; in which the former had the advantage, and in consequence of which, at the time of the death of Tiberius, Vitellius the president of Syria was actually on his march against him; led in its effects to his occupation of Damascus, I do not undertake to say. The supposition, however, is not improbable. For Aretas was thus placed in a state of hostility with the Roman government; and for two or three years afterwards, the presidents of Syria were too much engaged by the movements of the Parthian

^z Ant. xviii. vi. 10.
vii. 1. Bell. ii. xii. 8.
^e Ant. xviii. vi. 3.

^a Ib. xix. v. 1. Bell. ii. xi. 5.
^c Eckhel, iii. 331.

^b Ant. xx.
^d Vide the Appendix.

princes, to be able perhaps to attend to Damascus; which its vicinity to Arabia rendered easily obnoxious to attack or surprise from that quarter.

Be this as it may; there is certainly reason to believe that, between the time of the death of Herod, and the time of the accession of Claudius, the tetrarchy of Abila and the kingdom of Chalcis in particular, including perhaps the hereditary possession of Damascus; were restored to a descendant of the former Lysanias; who himself bore the same name, and was alive, when our Saviour entered on his ministry, but was dead, when his tetrarchy was conferred, fourteen years afterwards, by Claudius on Herod Agrippa. The exact time of his death is not mentioned: but it is a probable conjecture that it had not long taken place, nor consequently, that his tetrarchy had long been vacant, in the first year of the reign of Claudius. It is not likely that Damascus would come into possession of any other master, while this Lysanias was still alive; that is, as we have rendered it probable, before the third or the fourth of Caius; nor continue in his possession after the tetrarchy had been conferred upon another person; that is, after the first of Claudius. St. Paul's last year of residence in that city comes critically within the period, when it was certainly subject to Aretas; and if this last year of residence was, as I suppose, from the passover, U. C. 793, in the fourth of Caius, to the passover, U. C. 794, in the first of Claudius, this might actually be the case.

I think then that we may safely come to the conclusion that St. Paul's first return to Jerusalem after his conversion, was at the passover U. C. 794: but he had been converted three years and some months before that time; the years being dated with his return to Damascus from Arabia, the months from the time

of his conversion previously: he had been converted therefore one month or two after the feast of Tabernacles, U. C. 790; which is exactly where the Chronicon placed that event. On the same authority, then, as well as for the reasons which have been urged to that effect in the previous discussion, we are justified in placing the martyrdom of Stephen, and the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel to the Samaritans; which could not have happened a less time than this before it; about six months earlier; viz. at the Pentecost, U. C. 790; and that is precisely a week of years from the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews, at the Pentecost, U. C. 783. That Pentecost fell on May 26, and this on May 9.

It will considerably strengthen the above conclusions, if it does not rather place them beyond a question; that the first mission of St. Paul to the Gentiles may be shewn to have taken place about the Pentecost, U. C. 797; exactly another week of years from the Pentecost of U. C. 790, and two weeks of years from the Pentecost of U. C. 783. For this purpose, it is necessary first of all to demonstrate that the conversion of Cornelius, the earliest overt step in the development of the Christian scheme, as concerned the dispensation of the Gospel to any but Jews or Samaritans, is to be placed exactly between these extremes; viz. the Pentecost, U. C. 790, on the one hand, and the Pentecost, U. C. 797, on the other; sometime between the passover and the Pentecost, U. C. 794.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, has cited a fragment from the works of Apollonius, a Christian writer, who flourished so early as the reigns of Commodus and of Severus, to this effect^f. Ἔτι δὲ ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως, τὸν Σωτῆρα φησὶ προστεταχέναι τοῖς αὐτοῦ

^f v. 18. 186. C.

ἀποστόλοις, ἐπὶ δώδεκα ἔτεσι μὴ χωρισθῆναι τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ. The same tradition was contained in the *Prædicatio Petri*, cited by Clement of Alexandria, a contemporary of Apollonius; in the shape of a command from our Lord, as follows g: After twelve years go forth into the world; lest any one should say, we have not heard *.

What degree of credibility is to be ascribed to either of these traditions I do not undertake to say; I shall mention only that, at the first persecution of the church the twelve Apostles, as it is expressly stated, did not leave Jerusalem^h, though the rest of the disciples were scattered abroad: whereas, at the time of the secondⁱ, when Peter was delivered from prison, he went to another place. The time of the first persecution was U. C. 790, seven years later than the ascension; the time of the second was U. C. 796, thirteen years after the same event: the former was prior to the conversion of Cornelius, the latter was posterior to it.

If the course of events from Acts ix. 31, which we have shewn to coincide with the passover, U. C. 794, be pursued forwards as far as Acts xi. 21, it will incline any reasonable person to place the intermediate transaction of the conversion of Cornelius early in U. C. 794; not indeed earlier than the passover of that year, April 4; yet neither on the other hand later than the Pentecost, May 25: and most probably between the

* Clemens Alex. Opera, ii. 762, l. 9: Strom. vi. 5: διὰ τοῦτό φησιν ὁ Πέτρος εἰρηκέναι τὸν Κύριον τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις· Ἐὰν μὲν οὖν τις θελήσῃ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ μετανοῆσαι (*leg.* μετανοήσας) διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος μου πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ἀφεθήσονται

αὐτῷ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μετὰ δώδεκα ἔτη· ἐξέλθετε εἰς τὸν κόσμον, μὴ τις εἴπῃ, Οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν. The punctuation is here confused. The full point should be after ἁμαρτίαι: and the next sentence begin, μετὰ δὲ, &c.

g Cf. Grabii Spicilegium, i. 67.

h Acts viii. 1.

i xii. 1—17.

two, and nearer to the latter than to the former. Let us trace the order of accounts up to the time of this conversion, from some known point backwards. One such point may be determined.

The return of St. Paul and of Barnabas, from their eleemosynary mission to Jerusalem^k, is placed in the same year with the death of Herod Agrippa; after it, rather than before it.

The length of the reign of Herod is computed, in the Antiquities of Josephus, at seven years, and in the War, at six^l; to make which statements consistent, it is necessary to suppose that he reigned six years complete, and part of a seventh at least. In this case, his death would transpire not long after the beginning of his seventh year. I have had occasion to consider the beginning of his reign elsewhere^m; and to shew that, dated from the accession of Caius, March 16, U.C. 790, the first three years of it were passed by him merely as master of Trachonitis, and with the title of tetrarch; and dated from the deprivation of Herod Antipas, in the last year of Caius, U.C. 793, four more of it were passed, either wholly or in part, with the addition of the dominions of Antipas, and with the title of king. Of his whole reign therefore four years entirely, within one or two months, were passed under Caius, and the remaining three either entire or in part under Claudius; the three first of the whole with a limited extent of dominion, and the four last with the same dominion enlarged.

The third year of these four coincided consequently with the second of the emperor Claudius; and the fourth, if Agrippa had lived all through it, would have coincided with his third. But the third year was al-

^k Acts xii. 25.

^l Ant. xix. viii. 2. Bell. ii. xi. 6.

284—302. Dissertation vi.

^m Vol. i.

ready over at the point of time specified Ant. Jud. xix. viii. 2: and the death of Agrippa, which occurred afterwards, occurred consequently in the fourth. The time of the death of Agrippa then was necessarily some period in the fourth year of his reign over *all* Judæa, and in the third of the emperor Claudius, both answering to the same point of time, U. C. 796. And with respect to this period, if the reason assigned why the people of Tyre and Sidon were so anxious to pacify the kingⁿ, is to be literally understood, it could not be prior to corn harvest in that year; and was probably somewhat later. It must have been posterior to the passover^o; and it might be so even to the ensuing Pentecost. The festival, which Agrippa was celebrating in Cæsarea at the time of his death, was some festival in honour of Claudius, and ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνου σωτηρίας; whence we may reasonably suspect that it was a celebrity in honour of the emperor's birthday; viz. about the first of August^p. The passover of U.C. 796 fell out on April 12, and the Pentecost on June 2^q. The return then of St. Paul and of Barnabas to Antioch, if it occurred where St. Luke has placed it, occurred in all probability after June 2; or what is the same thing, after corn harvest, U.C. 796: and this conclusion may be further confirmed by the following considerations.

The mission upon which they were sent was produced by the prediction of Agabus relating to the famine^r; whence, if the return took place in the first half of U. C. 796, the prediction, followed as it was by the collection or provision of alms on an extensive scale, by the church at Antioch, for the anticipated necessities of the church at Jerusalem, could not have

ⁿ Acts xii. 20.
Claudius, 2.

^o Acts xii. 3.
^q Vol. i. 332. Dissertation vii.

^p Ant. Jud. xix. viii. 2. Suet.
^r Acts xi. 28.

taken place later than the last half of U.C. 795. Now, by a reference to a table of sabbatic years which will be exhibited hereafter, the thirtieth in the order there recited will be seen to fall out between seed-time U. C. 794 and seed-time U.C. 795, in the last half of the first, and the first half of the second of Claudius respectively. In this case, the prediction of the famine was delivered either in or immediately after the close of a sabbatic year; just before or just after the time when the operations of husbandry would begin to be renewed against the next year: and it must be self-evident that a famine, which was to occur under such circumstances, setting in in direct continuity upon a sabbatic year, would be of so much the more aggravated a nature where a sabbatic year had been previously observed. For at this period of Jewish history, when the extraordinary providence, which was once accustomed to bless the sixth year in a proportion threefold as great as usual, so as to supply the means of subsistence until the harvest of the eighth year came in, had long been withdrawn; a sabbatic year alone was always a period of dearth.

I have no doubt therefore that the prediction of the approaching famine was providentially made to take place at this juncture in particular: and that the prospect of a season of natural, in addition to the effects of a sabbatic scarcity, which the church of Judæa had to expect, was the chief moving cause of the eleemosynary contributions for their relief on the part of the disciples at Antioch. For though the famine itself—as the words of the prediction do plainly imply, and as I believe was actually the case—were about to be a general one, and more or less to affect the whole Roman empire; still, under the circumstances of the case, it could affect none of its inhabitants so soon nor

so deeply as the Jews. There is but one more instance on record, in the Acts of the Apostles, of any similar contribution by the churches abroad, for the particular benefit of the poor of the church in Judæa; and this too, as I shall shew in its proper place, was both collected *against*, and brought up by St. Paul to Jerusalem *in a sabbatic* year; and very probably with a view to provide for a period of dearth, which also, like the dearth at this time, was to ensue upon it.

But this supposes that the famine was to take place in the third of Claudius, U. C. 796; and there is good reason to believe it did begin in the third, though it was felt for some years afterwards. I am aware that Eusebius*, Orosius^s, and others, place it in the fourth; but if it continued till the fifth or the sixth, this is but an average statement; and perhaps it might be said with equal propriety to have begun either in the third or in the fourth: for in the nature of things, it must begin in one year, and be first felt in the next; for instance, it might be said to begin at the ordinary seed-time in the third of Claudius, so as to be perceptibly sensible, in the failure of the crops, at the ordinary reaping-time in the fourth.

By Josephus, its beginning and continuance both are placed during the consecutive administrations of the Roman procurators, Cuspius Fadus; (whose appointment was the first after the death of Herod Agrippa;) and Tiberius Alexander^t. Tiberius Alexander was superseded by Cumanus either in the year of the death of Herod of Chalcis, which happened in the eighth of Claudius, or in the year before

* Yet Eusebius, *Chronicon Arm.-Lat.* Pars ii^a. 269, dates the famine in the *first* of Claudius, or rather between that and the third.

^s Eusebius, *Chronic. Græcum.* Orosius, vii. 6.

^t *Ant. Jud.* xx. v. 2.

that, which would consequently be the seventh^t. It was the practice of the emperor Claudius to keep his procurators not less than two, and sometimes three years in office respectively; whence, if we assign to these two an equal length of time each, Fadus would not be superseded before the fifth of Claudius, U.C. 798, at the earliest; though Tiberius his successor might be so in the seventh, U.C. 800.

This conclusion is further established by the date of the rescript of Claudius, which Josephus has preserved^u, concerning the disposal of the sacerdotal vestures; a rescript issued a. d. iv. kal. Julias, or June 28, in the fifth year of the emperor's Tribunician authority; which is in fact tantamount to the fifth year of his reign^v; and consequently, U.C. 798*. Cuspius Fadus was still procurator of Judæa, and Cassius Longinus was still governor of Syria, when this rescript was transmitted. The famine had begun before this, and when Fadus went out of office it was most severe; whence, though he had not gone out of office until U.C. 799, and much more if he went out of office U.C. 798, the dearth, which had lasted for one year or more, could not have begun later than U.C. 797, and might have begun even in U.C. 796. •

It constitutes no difficulty that Josephus places the famine at the time of the visit of Helena, queen of the Adiabenes, to Jerusalem; and that visit before the

* The rescript, it is true, speaks of Claudius as consul designatus τὸ τέταρτον; which points to U.C. 799. But the two consuls, alluded to as in office at the time of the edict, viz. Rufus

and Silvanus, were so, according to the Fasti, ex Kalendis Jul. U.C. 798. This then is the true year of its date; in whatever way the other note of time is to be explained.

^t Ant. Jud. xx. v. 2. Cf. Bell. ii. xi. 6. Doctrina Numm. Vett. vi. 249.

^u Ant. Jud. xx. i. 2.

^v Eckhel,

death of Bardanes, king of Parthia^w. Bardanes died, according to Tacitus, U. C. 800 or U. C. 801, one year or two years after the reduction of Seleucia; the revolt of which had taken place seven years before its reduction, when he first came to the throne^x. If so, he came to the throne U. C. 794 at least.

But even this is too late a computation, and he must have come to the throne earlier; for according to Tacitus, Vibius Marsus was still president of Syria after Bardanes had reduced Seleucia. Now Cassius Longinus, who superseded Marsus, was certainly in office U. C. 798^y; so that Marsus could not well have been in office later than U. C. 797. Bardanes then could not have reduced Seleucia later than U. C. 797: nor consequently have come to the throne later than U. C. 791. In this year therefore must Artabanus his father have died; and consequently in the year before that must he have applied to Izates, and by his help been reinstated in his dominions^z. For he had been expelled from the throne of Parthia by a conspiracy of his nobles; the cause of which, as we may collect from Dio^a, was his submission to the images of Augustus and Caius; probably U. C. 790, or at least U. C. 791*. Now it was manifestly in the same year as that of the

* It is further implied, by Suetonius, Caius, 14, that Artabanus had paid the homage in question either U. C. 790 *ex-eunte*, or U. C. 791 *ineunte*.

It is said by Josephus, (Ant. Jud. xx. ii. 3,) that Izates, upon his accession to the throne of the Adiabenes, disposed of his brothers as hostages, some with Artabanus, others with Claudius

Cæsar. This last statement is doubtless a mistake. Artabanus was dead before the accession of Claudius. Josephus must mean either Tiberius or Caius. In like manner, the Artabanus alluded to as still reigning, even when Herod Antipas was deposed by Caius, (Ant. Jud. xviii. vii. 2.) must be meant of Bardanes.

^w Ant. Jud. xx. ii. 5. v. 2. iii. 4. ^x Annales, xi. 10. 8. 9. ^y Eckhel, iii. 280.
^z Ant. Jud. xx. iii. 1—3. ^a lix. 27.

reduction of Seleucia, that Bardanes applied to Izates to join him in a war against the Romans. At this time Helena, the mother of Izates, was in Jerusalem, and the famine was going on. If so, the famine was going on U. C. 797.

The accounts of Tacitus, with reference to this sketch of the contemporary Parthian history, are manifestly full of difficulties; which however it does not concern me to specify in detail. I will observe only that the coins ascribed to these kings of Parthia, Artabanus, Bardanes, Gotarzes^b, do not solve, but rather add to our perplexity; yet not so but that the statement, which I have endeavoured to make out above, may still be true in all its parts. On this principle the death of Bardanes would ensue U. C. 798 or U. C. 799: Gotarzes would then succeed him: and Gotarzes had probably reigned one year or two years before the Parthians, wearied out by his cruelties, sent to Rome, U. C. 802, to fetch Meherdates thence * c.

* It is scarcely worth while to cite the authority of Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii Tyanei*, upon the subject in question: as that life is full of chronological difficulties, which it is in vain to attempt to explain. Yet (i. 15. 29. B.) he supposes Bardanes to be king of Parthia, when his hero was on his way to India; ὁ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπολωλυίαν τότε αὐτῷ νῦν ἀνακεκτημένος: which recovery (cap. 19. 39. C. D.) had preceded the visit of Apollonius by two years and two months. Lib. iii. 16. 157. B: i. 16. 31. B, the same king was still reigning when Apollonius returned from India, eighteen months at least after the former visit; and

consequently four years after Bardanes' recovery of his throne. All which, if there be any truth in these accounts, must have happened between U. C. 791 and U. C. 797.

But Apollonius is supposed to visit India when he was about thirty years of age: and by comparing Lib. i. 5. 9. 10: Tacitus, Ann. ii. 42: Lib. i. 11. 19. C. D. we may collect that he was born about U. C. 752. Nor could Philostratus himself have conceived that he was born earlier than U. C. 750 or U. C. 751: for he makes him live to be one hundred years old, (18. A. 428. B,) yet viii. 2. 11, die before the end of the reign of Nerva, U. C. 850.

^b Eckhel, iii. 533—536.

^c Tacitus, Ann. xi. 10. xii. 10.

It is certain at least that Artabanus had paid homage to the statue of Caius, before U. C. 792, the third of his reign, when he was building the bridge at Bauli; for Darius, whom the Parthian king gave up as an hostage, was present at Baiaë when the bridge in question was completed^d. Josephus, it is true, supposes this Darius to have been sent to Tiberius^e: but let any one compare the annexed passages from Dio and Suetonius^f, and then say if it is likely that Artabanus would ever pay such a mark of submission to Tiberius, though he possibly might to Caius. If so, this assertion is to be ranked among the other inaccuracies of Josephus; and Darius was sent in reality to Caius*. But to return from this digression.

By the historian Dio, a famine at Rome, which, as I think, may reasonably be supposed synchronous with this in the Acts; and a proof that that was not, as some have imagined, a famine confined to Judæa†; is men-

Hence Apollonius could not have gone to India before U. C. 780 or 781: and to suppose Bardanes reigning in Parthia at that time is to commit an anachronism of ten or eleven years.

* The hostage Darius, indeed, might be sent to Tiberius; and be received by Caius. Dio, lix. 17, seems to place his mission U. C. 792; but Artabanus himself was then dead.

† The same conclusion appears to me to be intimated equally strongly by the fact which Suetonius mentions in the Life of Galba^g, when he was proconsul of Africa. The scarcity of corn at that time must have been unexampled, if the modius rose to the enormous price of one

hundred denarii.

In the first year of Claudius^h, Galba was employed in Germany. In the third year of his reign, the emperor undertook his British expeditionⁱ; and that in the first half of the year; as he set out during his consulate, which he held that year six months, and was absent six months only. Galba was then at Rome; but in the course of the same year, Suetonius and Dio, laid together^k, lead to the inference that he was appointed to settle the affairs of Africa, *extra ordinem*. His two years' government, then, would bear date from U. C. 796—consequently, in U. C. 797, or U. C. 798, the period of scarcity would intervene. According to Dio,

^d Suet. Caius, 19. Tiberius, 66. ^g Cap. 7. Galba, 7. Dio, lx. 9.

^e Ant. Jud. xviii. iv. 5. ^h Dio, lx. 8.

^f Dio, lix. 27. Suet. ⁱ Ib. 17. 19. 21. 23. ^k Suet.

tioned immediately subsequent to the consulship of Claudius and Largus, that is, U. C. 795^m: which would imply that it must have begun to be felt either as early as the second of Claudius, or at least as early as his third. I believe this latter to have been the case; nor is it any thing uncommon to find a slight anticipation of this kind in the later books of Dio.

According to the same authority, the harbour of Ostia was begun in consequence of the famineⁿ; and along with the project of this port mention is made of another undertaking of Claudius'; the draining of the Fucine lake into the Tiber. These two undertakings Dio, Suetonius, Pliny, and Eusebius in *Chronico*^o all specify in such an order, as to imply that the latter was begun before the former. Now the latter was completed U. C. 805 *exeunte*^p; after the lapse of eleven years from its commencement, at least^q. It could not have begun then later than U. C. 795 *ineunte*; and consequently the port of Ostia, begun after it, but either in the same year or in the next, was probably begun U. C. 796. If so, the famine which produced it, happened about the same time. There are coins of Nero's extant, which commemorate the completion of the port^r, and therefore prove it to have been a work of great toil and length of time; but they furnish no criteria by which we might determine their date.

lx. 17, there was a general scarcity at Rome, U. C. 796. Compare also lx. 24. U. C. 797. The soldiers serving in Mauritania, to whom the governor of Bætica was accused of not sending the adequate supplies of corn, were serving at that very time with

Galba. In this instance we find Africa receiving supplies of corn from Spain; and yet, according to Josephus^s, under ordinary circumstances, Africa alone supplied Rome with corn for eight months in the year; as Egypt did for the remaining four.

^m lx. 10. 11. ⁿ lx. 11. ^o Suet. Claudius, 20. Eusebius, apud Hieronymum. Pliny, H. N. xxxvi. 24. §. 11. 12. Cf. H. N. ix. 5. xvi. 76. §. 2. xxxvi. 14. §. 4. Seneca, Nat. Questiones, iii. iii. 1. Quintilian, ii. xxi. 18: iii. viii. 16.
^p Tacitus, Ann. xii. 56. ^q Suet. Claudius, 20. ^r Eckhel, vi. 276.
^s Bell. Jud. ii. xvi. 4. p. 482. Vide also Tacitus, Ann. xii. 43.

The prediction of Agabus, then, cannot be placed later than the last half of U.C. 795; nor the consequent mission of Paul and Barnabas earlier than the spring of U. C. 796. But before this mission a year had been spent with the church at Antioch^s; which at the time of the prediction did not want much, if any thing, of being completed. And this would be the case accordingly, if the year in question consisted of the last half of the first and the first half of the second of Claudius; from U. C. 794 to U. C. 795, both about the middle. Before the commencement of this year, consequently before or about U.C. 794 *medium*, Barnabas had fetched Saul from Tarsus (where he had been left U. C. 794 *in-eunte*) to Antioch^t; and before even Barnabas did this, he had himself been sent down to Antioch from Jerusalem; the cause of which mission was the report concerning the progress of the Gospel, as preached to the Hellenists in that city, which had come to the ears of the church at Jerusalem ^u. These Hellenists *as such* are distinctly opposed to the Jews *as such*, who are mentioned also^v; and this being the case, the beginning to preach the Gospel at Antioch to them was a different thing from the beginning to preach it there to the Jews. The latter had begun and been going on ever since the dispersion, produced by the persecution at the death of Stephen; the former cannot be placed earlier than the time of the conversion of Cornelius; where too the context of the narrative evidently supposes it to take place*.

* In this coincidence also there would be reason to admire the consistency of the Divine Providence, in the gradual development of its purposes; and in the adaptation of one step, in the

progress of the Christian scheme, to another; with the suitability of every step to the time and the occasion of its occurrence. The Gospel began to be preached to native Jews *out of*

^s Acts xi. 26.

^t Acts ix. 30. xi. 25.

^u xi. 22.

^v Ib. 19. 20.

I place the conversion of Cornelius, then, in U. C. 794, sufficiently early for these events to take place in their proper order after it; viz. the success of the Christian evangelists at Antioch; the news of this success at Jerusalem; the mission of Barnabas to Antioch in consequence of the news; and his bringing of Saul from Tarsus thither: either all before, or the last of them but a little later than the autumn of U. C. 794. In this case, the conversion of Cornelius, the common ἀρχὴ of these circumstances, cannot be placed later than the midsummer of the same year; that is, it happened either at, or somewhat before the Pentecost of U. C. 794, which was May 25: and this conclusion will perhaps be supported by the following consideration.

At Acts xii. 17, there is such a distinct and special mention of James, the brother of our Lord, as justifies us in supposing that he already possessed a specific rank in the church of Jerusalem; and yet it is the first of the kind; and it comes in, as we see, at the pass-over of U. C. 796, after the conversion of Cornelius. It is an unquestionable fact that this James was bishop of Jerusalem; and if he had been appointed subsequently to the conversion of Cornelius, U. C. 794, it would do much to confirm the tradition above alluded to, that for twelve years the Apostles were not to leave Jeru-

Judæa, just at the time when it began to be preached to Samaritans, and not merely to Jews, *within* Judæa; and it now began to be preached to Jews of the Dispersion *out* of Judæa, when it had just been thrown open to Gentiles by the conversion of Cornelius, though neither a Jew nor a Samaritan, *within* Judæa. So orderly and consistent with itself was the whole of this pro-

ceeding from first to last; and so harmoniously did one step, in its progressive advancement to its final effect, (which was the publication of the Gospel to the whole rational and responsible creation under heaven—to all sorts and conditions of the human race, whether Jews or Gentiles, Samaritans, or of the Dispersion,) fit in with and correspond to another.

salem ; and consequently that at the end of twelve they were. While they were all in Jerusalem and all actively engaged on the spot, it is reasonable to presume they would all be at the head of the church alike * ; and so, from Acts vi. 2. viii 1. 14. ix. 27. 32. xi. 1, before this point of time in U. C. 796, they are manifestly seen to be. But when they were beginning to prepare for the business of preaching the Gospel on a more enlarged scale than before, and in other parts of the world besides Judæa ; the necessity of appointing some one to reside with and to preside over the mother church permanently would be evident even to ordinary wisdom and prudence : in which case, (if the choice was not dictated by the Holy Ghost himself †,) none was so likely to be selected for the government of a church, which consisted exclusively of the brethren of Christ according to the flesh, as James, the brother of Christ according to the flesh.

The conversion of Cornelius, U. C. 794, just eleven years after the ascension, U. C. 783, would be the first direct intimation that the extension of the Gospel upon a larger scale was at hand ; and the commencement of the preaching to the Jews of the Dispersion, which synchronized with that, would be a still more decisive indication to the same effect. When Christian evangelists had begun to preach to these, and with such success, at their own homes ; the Apostles themselves could not but think it was time for them too to be preparing to preach among their brethren abroad.

Concerning the time when they probably quitted

* Cf. Matt. xxiii. 8—10 : which seems to me entirely irreconcilable with the supposition that any *one* apostle as such could be advanced to the rank and dignity of bishop over the

rest as such.

† Chrysostom, *Operum* x. 355. D. In i. ad Cor. Homilia xxxviii. 4. mentions a tradition that James was ordained bishop of Jerusalem by the hands of our Lord himself.

Judæa, something has been said elsewhere ^w: and this time was there limited to between U. C. 794, A. D. 41, and U. C. 797, A. D. 44. But perhaps what has now been urged may be some reason why it should be limited something more. At the time of the visit of Paul to Jerusalem, U. C. 794 *ineunte*, and after the conversion of Cornelius in the same year; all the Apostles seem still to have been in Jerusalem, and still at the head of the church. Nor is Galatians i. 19 any objection. For unless more of the Apostles had then been in Jerusalem than Peter and James, it would not be mentioned as any thing particular that St. Paul saw those two only; and whatever distinction may be apparently conferred on James by the nature of this allusion, it may be due as much to what he became *afterwards*, as to what he was *then*. When he was appointed the head of the church at Jerusalem, he was rendered an object of peculiar distinction; and he had long been at the head of that church when the Epistle to the Galatians was written.

When however Herod Agrippa stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church; and that, as it seems, because it pleased his subjects; James, the brother of John, and Peter were the only two of the Apostles, on whom his injuries took effect, or were intended to do so; what then had become of the rest of the Apostles? of none of whom except James does any mention occur, as present in Jerusalem at the time. Is it not a natural inference, that Peter, and James the brother of our Lord, and his namesake James the brother of John, (unless perhaps John, the brother of this last, should be added to the number,) were the only Apostles actually on the spot? Now this was at the passover, U. C. 796. If we suppose

^w Vol. i. 143—153. Dissertation ii.

that the year before, U. C. 795, all but these *four* left Jerusalem; we account for this; and we advance no improbable conjecture. On the contrary, it is one which derives support both from the tradition above mentioned; the antiquity of which must be some voucher for its truth; and more especially from the fact that St. James, before the passover, U. C. 794, and the conversion of Cornelius, does not appear to have been already the bishop of Jerusalem, but before the passover, U. C. 796, and ever after it he does. It is an obvious inference that he became so in U. C. 795: which, if it was an appointment preparatory to all, or to a part of the Apostles' beginning to preach to their brethren of the Circumcision in countries beyond Judæa, would imply that this preparation did not take place until the thirteenth year from the ascension, U. C. 783; before which year one of the forms of the tradition in question supposes that they would not leave Judæa, and in which the other, as recited from the *Prædicatio Petri*, naturally supposes they would.

With regard then to the last object of our consideration, the actual time of St. Paul's first mission to the Gentiles—in the first place, Acts xii. 25, compared with xii. 12; at the time of the latter of which Mark was still in Jerusalem, and at that of the former, was taken by Paul and Barnabas with them to Antioch; proves that their return from Jerusalem was later than the passover, and even than the last day of the feast of unleavened bread, April 19, U. C. 796: secondly, if the order of narration in these particulars was also the order of succession, it proves that it was later than the death of Herod, which we have seen was probably either the midsummer of the same year, after Pentecost, June 2, or later than it, after the birthday of Claudius, August 1: thirdly, it appears from Acts xiii. 1; that there was

some time spent at Antioch, even after the return and before the mission, which begins to be recounted at verse the third: fourthly, from Acts xiii. 2 it is evident that the time, the manner, and the instruments in this final and conclusive step of throwing open the Gospel, upon a large and indiscriminate scale, to the Gentiles, were all of the choice and the appointment of the Holy Ghost.

From the period of the year, therefore, which was clearly too late, after the return from Jerusalem, to undertake any such mission in U. C. 796; from the nature of the undertaking itself, which may be considered as the consummation of the scheme proposed by the Divine Providence from the first; from the analogy of the previous history of this scheme, in which every more important and cardinal step is seen to be determined to the period of a feast of Pentecost; and lastly, from the evident observance of a fixed ratio or proportion of time between each of these steps: we may safely perhaps assume, that the first mission of St. Paul to the Gentiles, which begins at Acts xiii. 4, and could not begin U. C. 796, would begin U. C. 797, and at the Pentecost in that year, May 21^a; three years after the conversion of Cornelius, U. C. 794, when the Pentecost fell on May 25, and the passover on April 4; seven years after the martyrdom of Stephen, and the communication of the Gospel to the Samaritans, U. C. 790, when the Pentecost fell on May 9; and fourteen years after its first communication to the Jews, U. C. 783, when the Pentecost fell on May 26*.

* Nor ought it to appear extraordinary that the intervals, included by all these steps, are either parts or multiples of seasons; that is, either weeks or half-weeks as before. The analogy of the prophecy might lead us to expect this; and I have

These points then being all established, we may be considered to have done enough for the exposition of the prophecy of the seventy weeks ; which, beginning with U. C. 296, B. C. 458, in the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and ending with U. C. 790, A. D. 37, in the first of Caius Cæsar, is thus found to consist

shewn elsewhere^b that a like distribution of time is observable in other instances. It may be proved even, as we shall see hereafter, that the whole duration of St. Paul's ministry, from the time of his commencing to preach the Gospel, U. C. 791, after his conversion, U. C. 790, to the time of his final imprisonment, was very probably twenty-eight years, or four weeks of years ; and the whole duration of St. Peter's, from the Pentecost U. C. 783, to the same time, was very probably just seven years, or one week more.

It is true that the first seven years of the history of St. Paul, between his conversion and his mission to the Gentiles, are either passed over in silence, or are but imperfectly related : yet within that time we may reasonably suppose that some of those incidents occurred, to which he afterwards alludes, 2 Cor. xi. 25. These incidents must all have taken place before the time when that Epistle was written ; that is, as I shall shew elsewhere, before the middle of U. C. 808 ; yet the previous history in the Acts ascertains the fact of two only among them—his being stoned at Lystra, and his being beaten with rods at Philippi^c.

It is manifestly possible however that both at Damascus, during his three years' residence in that city, before his return to Jerusalem ; and at Tarsus, previous to his coming to Antioch, which was almost a year after ; he might often be scourged by the Jews, to whom his preaching was still confined.

There is more of difficulty connected with the fact of his shipwrecks ; yet he might suffer shipwreck *once* when he was sent from Judæa by sea to Tarsus^d : for that was in the spring of the year, early in the month of April ; and he might then also pass the *night* and the *day* in the deep. There were other occasions after this, before U. C. 808, when he was certainly travelling by sea, sometimes with Barnabas, and sometimes by himself ; but if he had met with any such accident then, I think the writer of the Acts would have mentioned it. The allusion to his personal sufferings, 2 Tim. iii. 11, places it beyond a question that, whatever had befallen him elsewhere before his first mission to the Gentiles, much must have befallen him upon *that*—in Pisdian Antioch, in Iconium, and in Lystra.

^b Vol. i. 364, 365. Dissertation x.

^c xiv. 19. xvi. 22.

^d ix. 30.

of four consecutive periods, amounting in all to four hundred and ninety-three years and six months ; that is, to seventy prophetic weeks, and one half of such a week besides. There is still however something to be said concerning it. The division of the two first of the periods, though continuous and consecutive in themselves, into *seven* weeks and *sixty-two* weeks ; which has struck every commentator on the prophecy as something remarkable, and doubtless is significant ; and yet which no one has hitherto been able to explain satisfactorily ; deserves some portion of our attention before we dismiss the subject.

It is unquestionable that the prophecy speaks so much, and in such plain terms, of some determinate desolation, and of its appointed continuance and consummation ; that it would be absurd to deny its reference to this further topic, as well as to those other particulars, which have been largely discussed already. Yet, if the desolation intended must be understood, as I apprehend no one will be disposed to question, of the judgments which, on account of the rejection of Christianity, were ultimately to be inflicted on the Jews ; its reference to that topic must be by the way, and over and above its proper topic, which is the advent of the Messiah, his personal history, and the formal dispensation of the Gospel.

Now, from Dan. ix. 26, it will appear that this desolation, as well as the coming and cutting off of the Messiah, is placed at the end of the sixty and nine weeks ; and from ix. 27, that it is placed at the end of the making of sacrifice and oblation to cease ; which are in fact the same thing. I infer then that this period of sixty-nine weeks, or four hundred and eighty-three years, if its proper beginning can be determined, will be the period prescribed in the prophecy for

the beginning, continuance, and completion of the desolation in question: and I conjecture that the use of the previous division of the period into seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, is to determine its proper beginning, or that point of time from which *this* calculation likewise is to proceed.

Seven weeks, or *forty-nine* years, being accordingly deducted from B. C. 458, or added to U. C. 296; this new ἀρχή will begin and proceed from U. C. 345, B. C. 409: and the four hundred and eighty-three years, extending from thence to the end of the appointed desolation, if we are right in these conjectures, will expire U. C. 828, A. D. 75. At this time accordingly it was, but not before it, that a final stop was put to the calamities of the Jewish war; as the following statements from Josephus, De Bello Judaico, will serve to prove.

I. In the month Artemisius, which answers to the second month in the Jewish sacred year*, and not later than the sixteenth day of that month, U. C. 819, in the twelfth of Nero, the war began^e: on the fifteenth of Lous, or the sixth of Gorpiaeus following, three or four months afterwards, the fortress of Masada was seized by the partisans of Manahem^f: on the eighth of Dios, two or three months after that occupation, Cestius Gallus, the president of Syria, who had meantime come before Jerusalem, and made his attack upon the city first on the last day of Hyperberetæus, the preceding month, was finally routed in his retreat^g.

II. On the first of Panemus, which answers to the fourth month in the Jewish year, U. C. 820, in the

* It is only by supposing the contest to have broken out in this month, U. C. 819, that we can explain Bell. iv. ix. 12, where

Xanthicus, U. C. 822, is spoken of as *in* the third year of the war's continuance. It was truly so, in the *third* year *exeunte*.

^e ii. xiv. 4. xv. 2.

^f ii. xvii. 2—8.

^g ii. xix. 4. 9.

thirteenth of Nero, Jotapata was reduced^a: and on the twenty-third of Hyperberetæus following, which answers to the seventh month, so was Gamala^b.

III. The course of events is brought down next to the time of the death of Nero^c; that is, to the second week in June, U.C. 821*.

IV. Vespasian was proclaimed emperor; that is, the History of the War is brought down to July the first, July the third, or July the eleventh, U.C. 822^d.

V. In the month Xanthicus, which answers to Nisan in the Jewish year, between the fourteenth and the twenty-first day of the month, and even on the fourteenth itself while the Jewish passover was going on, U.C. 823, in the first year of Vespasian, Titus Cæsar sat down to the siege of Jerusalem^e.

VI. On the seventeenth of the ensuing Panemus, which answered to the Jewish Thamuz, the daily sacrifice failed^f: on the twenty-fourth of the same month fire was set to the temple^g: on the tenth of Lous, the ensuing month, the temple was burnt to the ground^h: and on the eighth of Gorpiaëus, the month after that, which according to Dio was a sabbath day, Jerusalem itself was taken and destroyedⁱ.

VII. The birthday of Domitian is mentioned as celebrated by Titus, and subsequently that of Vespasian, both in the same year in which the destruction of Jerusalem took place; that is, the course of events is

* This is what Tacitus means, when (Hist. v. 10.) he speaks of Judæa's being reduced by Vespasian, *intra duas æstates*: the summer, viz. of U.C. 820 and

U.C. 821 respectively: before the further prosecution of the war was interrupted for a time, by the events in the west, subsequently to the death of Nero.

^a iii. vii. 36.

^b iv. i. 9.

^c iv. ix. 2.

^d iv. x. 4.

Suet. Vespasianus, 6. Tacitus, *Historiæ*, ii. 79.

^e Bell. v. iii. 1.

^f v. xiii. 7.

^g vi. ix. 3.

^h vi. ii. 1.

Mishna, tom. ii. 7. 382.

ⁱ vi. ii. 9.

^j vi. iv. 5.

^k vi. viii. 5. x. 1. Dio, lxxvi. 7.

brought down to the IX. kal. of November, and to the xv. kal. of December, U. C. 823^k.

VIII. After this, there is an account of the triumph of Titus at Rome^l; the time of which it is impossible to place earlier than the spring or the midsummer of the next year, U. C. 824*. This triumph therefore took place either in the last half of the second, or in the first half of the third of Vespasian; and the History of the War in each case, as it is manifest, is brought down to the close of the fourth, and the commencement of the fifth year of its continuance. But this is not all. In the next chapter mention is made of the fourth of Vespasian^m; which began July the first, U. C. 825, and ended June the thirtieth, U. C. 826: in which fourth year, on the fifteenth of Xanthicus, U. C. 826, A. D. 73, in the seventh year of the war *exeunte*, the history places the recapture of Masadaⁿ, the last act of the war in Judæa, but not the last act of the war ἀπλως, (as the very continuation of the history of it beyond this period is by itself sufficient to prove^o;) nor consequently the last act of the predicted desolation, before it reached its completion†.

* Eckhel, vi. 351, 352. 362: though the precise month or day on which Titus celebrated his triumph, was appointed Imperator, Pontifex Maximus, and was invested with the Tribunitia Potestas, at Rome, in this year, (as his coins prove he was sometime,) is not known, yet it was certainly before July 1, the date of his Tribunitia Potestas on the one hand, and the first of March or the Nones of April, when Domitian was consul suffect, on the other. For Domitian, according to Zonaras, xi. 17, 577. C. ac-

companied his brother's triumphal procession, as consul, at the time. Cf. Eckhel, vi. 369: Suet. Domitianus, 2.

† To this we may add, that Bell. vii. v. 7. mention is made of the foundation of the temple of Peace, by Vespasian, after the triumph of Titus, U. C. 824; and of its completion also: an event which, as we learn from Dio, (lxvi. 15.) synchronized with U. C. 828. Josephus, then, had not done with the History of the War before U. C. 828.

^k vii. iii. 1. Suet. Domitianus, 1. Vespasianus, 2. ^l Bell. vii. v. 5. ^m vii. vii. 1.
ⁿ vii. ix. 1. ^o vii. x. 1. xi. 5.

The tenth and the eleventh chapters of the seventh book give an account, the former of the desecration of the temple of Onias in Egypt^p; and the latter of the destruction of the false prophet Jonathan with his followers, at Cyrene in Africa; each of them an event which arose directly out of the war; in both of which the zealots, who had escaped from the wreck of their party in Judæa, were mainly concerned; and both no more than necessary to the fulfilment of the measure of the Jewish calamities. The time of these two transactions was nearly synchronous; and the date of the former is ascertained by the assertion that the temple, before its desecration, had been three hundred and forty-three years in existence^q: in which number, the centenary figure is manifestly erroneous, and the true date, as it came from the author, I have no doubt, was two hundred and forty-three.

The time of the construction of the temple, on the authority of the War, compared with the Antiquities^r, is to be placed somewhere between *Ær. Sel.* 143, and *Ær. Sel.* 145; but on the authority of the Antiquities exclusively, must be dated some time after Alcimus was made high-priest: which both the Antiquities and the first of Maccabees^s demonstrate could not have been earlier than *Ær. Sel.* 150. The history of its construction is given in its place in the Antiquities, xiii. iii. 1—3; which account however must be a parenthetic one; or the foundation of the temple will be still differently represented even there, and will come somewhere between *Ær. Sel.* 160, and *Ær. Sel.* 165: as may thus be proved.

Alexander Bala came to the throne of Syria, *Ær. Sel.* 160^t, and died five years after, *Ær. Sel.* 165^u.

^p Section 2—4. ^q vii. x. 4. ^r Bell. i. i. 1. Ant. xii. v. 3. 4. ^s Ant. xii. ix. 3. 7. ^t Mac. vii. i. 9. Ant. xx. x. 1. ^u Ib. iv. 3. 8.

Demetrius his predecessor reigned eleven years before his death^v; and he came to the throne on the death of Antiochus Eupator, after a reign of two years in length^w: and Antiochus Eupator succeeded his father, Antiochus Epiphanes, Ær. Sel. 149, as the context proves, *exeunte*^x. Demetrius consequently began to reign either Ær. Sel. 150 *exeunte*, or Ær. Sel. 151 *ineunte*: eleven years current from which bring us to Ær. Sel. 161 *ineunte*. The account of the building of the temple comes in after the close of the reign of Demetrius, and before the beginning of the reign of Bala; that is, Ær. Sel. 161 or 162, at least*. But Alcimus was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator himself^y; and that, after he had granted terms to Judas Macca bæus; consequently, Ær. Sel. 150, a little before his own death.

It is impossible that each of these statements should be correct; and, without pretending to determine between them, it is enough for my purpose if I can prove that Josephus, as was naturally to be expected in the last part of the history of the temple, follows the date which he had given before in the War, and not that which appears in the Antiquities: whence, if the former can be determined, the year of the desecration of the temple may be determined accordingly.

In the number 343, the necessity of the case compels us to correct the first of the terms, and to conclude that Josephus wrote or intended to write 243: but

* Eckhel, iii. 226: the coins of Demetrius bear date from Æræ Seleuc. 153–162: those of Bala, from Æræ Seleucid. 162–166: which proves that Æræ Seleucid. 162 was common to the reign of both. These indi-

cations may easily be reconciled with our statements, by supposing Demetrius to have reigned twelve current years, (vide Polybius, iii. 5,) and Bala four complete.

v Ant. xiii. ii. 4.

w Ant. xii. x. 1.

x Ib. ix. i. 2. 3.

y Ant. xii. ix. 7.

there is no necessary reason, *a priori*, nor any authority from manuscripts, to suspect the integrity of the two last. Now the emperor Vespasian was still alive after the desecration of the temple, and even after the insurrection of Jonathan^z: but he was not alive after the ix. kal. July, or June 23, U. C. 832, A. D. 79, when he died and Titus succeeded to the throne^a. The 150 Ær. Sel. falls between Oct. 1, U. C. 591, B. C. 163, and Oct. 1, U. C. 592, B. C. 162: and though the temple had been founded this very year, B. C. 162, U. C. 592, its suppression, two hundred and forty-three years afterwards, must have coincided with the same time, U. C. 835, A. D. 82, two or three years after the death of Vespasian, and in the last year of Titus.

But if it was founded in the year after the flight of Onias, produced by the first invasion of Antiochus Epiphanes, when he was invited by the sons of Tobias, the supporters of a rival Onias^{*b}, Ær. Sel. 143: which was manifestly the impression on the mind of Josephus, when he wrote the War; it was founded U. C. 585, B. C. 169: and its suppression, two hundred and forty-three years afterwards, fell out exactly U. C. 828, A. D. 75. For Ær. Sel. 143 answers in part to U. C. 584, B. C. 170; and in part to U. C. 585, B. C. 169: from either of which last dates, to the same time, U. C. 828,

* It appears from the Antiquities, and from the War, that there were two persons of the name of Onias; one the son of the high priest Onias, left a minor at his father's death; another, the high priest's brother; yet called Onias also; who assumed, however, the name of Menelaus. It was this Onias, or Menelaus, who dispossessed

the other of the priesthood; and the sons of Tobias were his abettors. It was the other Onias, his nephew, who founded the temple in Egypt: vide Ant. Jud. xii. v. i: ix. 7: Bell. Jud. i. i. 1: Cf. also Eusebius, Chron. Arm.-Lat. Pars i^a. 239, where a similar account of these particulars is given.

^z vii. xi. 3. Vita Jos. 76.
xli. v. 3. 1 Mac. i. 20.

^a Suet. Vespasianus, 24. Dio, lxi. 17.

^b Ant.

A. D. 75, there are exactly two hundred and forty-three years. There can be little doubt, then, that whether right or wrong in itself, this is the calculation followed by Josephus in his computation of the age of the temple. To this time, from U. C. 345, or B. C. 409, there were just four hundred and eighty-three years as before.

There is a note of time in the Life of Josephus, where he is addressing himself to Justus of Tiberias; which, had it been more definite, would have determined the close of the war: *πρὸ γὰρ εἴκοσιν ἐτῶν εἶχες γεγραμμένην* ^b. The same passage shews that Agrippa was then dead, and that the history of Justus had been published since his death; whence, if its date is to be referred to the time of that death, as specified by Photius^c; (who himself also says that the history of Justus was brought down to the death of Agrippa;) it follows that it had been written twenty years at least before the third of Trajan; that is, before U. C. 853, or U. C. 854: which seems to place the conclusion of the war U. C. 833, or U. C. 834, in the first or the last year of Titus.

But this assertion, respecting the death of Agrippa, rests solely on the authority of Photius; and is liable to many objections. First, the Life of Josephus, on that supposition, must have been written after the third of Trajan; but he no where mentions any emperor as then alive, or as having been so any time before, except Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. Neither Nerva nor Trajan is so much as alluded to by him. The inference from this fact is that he wrote his Life under the last of the three above mentioned, Domitian.

Secondly, all the extant works of Josephus, excepting the short treatise *De Maccabæis*, are dedicated to the same person, and may be proved to have been so dedi-

^b Sectio lxxv. 100.

^c Bibliotheca, Codex 33. p. 6. l. 31. *ad dextram*. Justus

cated in the following order : first, the War ; secondly, the Antiquities ; thirdly, the Life^d ; and lastly the Two Books against Apion. This person is called Epaphroditus ; and I have no doubt he is the same with the grammarian of that name, mentioned by Suidas^e, as one who had been a slave, and had afterwards obtained his freedom : an ardent lover of learning, and a great collector of books ; and who lived until the reign of Nerva. If this was the case, the Life of Josephus was certainly written before the beginning of the reign of Nerva ; September, U. C. 849*.

Thirdly, we are told in the Antiquities^f, that all the posterity of Herod became extinct or nearly so within an hundred years of his death ; that is, by U. C. 850 : whence it may be reasonably inferred that Agrippa did not survive beyond that period : and it is a singular coincidence that there are extant coins of his, which prove him to have been alive U. C. 848, so late as the last year but one of Domitian ; but none which proves him to have been alive later^g : and had he died at the very beginning of this year, this proof would still hold good. The twenty-sixth year on one of his coins,

* There was another Epaphroditus, indeed, a freedman of Nero's^h, whom Domitian is said to have put to death, U. C. 848ⁱ, and whose history would so far synchronize with that of Josephus : but this man must not be confounded with the personal friend of Josephus, especially as the Epaphroditus of Nero was put to death by Domitian, but this other Epaphroditus lived into the reign of Nerva,

and died at 75 years old, of the dropsy. Epaphroditus, Nero's freedman, was the master to whom the celebrated philosopher Epictetus was a slave. Suidas, Ἐπίκτητος. He is there described as the captain of Nero's body guard.

Stephanus Byz. Βιθύμιον, mentions Pinytus as a native of that place ; as a grammarian ; and as a freedman of Epaphroditus, τοῦ Νέρωνος, who flourished at Rome.

^d Vita, 76. Cf. Contra Apionem, i. 1. 10. ii. 40. 41. ^e Ἐπαφρόδιτος. Cf. also ad ἀνακεχωρηκότων. ^f xviii. v. 3. ^g Eckhel, Doct. Numm. Vett. iii. 496.

^h Tacitus, xv. 55. Suet. Nero, 49.

ⁱ Suet. Domitianus, 14. Dio, lxvii. 14. Pliny, Panegyricus, 53. 4.

which year began U.C. 839, synchronizes with Domitian's twelfth consulate; viz. between January first, U.C. 839, and January first, U.C. 840; whence we may infer that his years bore date either from the same beginning as the consular years, or from the middle of some such year.

Josephus, having finished the *Antiquities*, concluded with telling his friend Epaphroditus, that he would proceed to the memoir of his life; the time when he finished the *Antiquities* being the fifty-sixth year of his own age, and the thirteenth year of Domitian, the reigning emperor. The thirteenth of Domitian falls between September U.C. 846, and September U.C. 847: and Josephus was born in the first of Caius, U.C. 790^k. He finished his *Antiquities* then in the last half of U.C. 846, or early in the first half of U.C. 847. It is exceedingly probable, therefore, that he did not compose his *Life* before U.C. 848: at which time, I have shewn that, for ought we know to the contrary, Agrippa might be dead. Hence it would be no objection that *Ant. xvi. vii. 1*, speaks of some of the posterity of Herod as still alive and reigning, though Agrippa might be one of the number; for the time of that allusion belongs to U.C. 846 or U.C. 847.

The history of Justus seems to have been published immediately upon the death of Agrippa; and consequently in U.C. 848: whence, if it could not have been written before the conclusion of the war, and had been written twenty years before it was published, the war could not have been concluded, nor the history of it written, before U.C. 828. That there was no such history in being when Josephus published his *Antiquities*, though so late as U.C. 846 or U.C. 847, may be safely collected from his not making any mention of it.

There is an allusion to it however upon the first mention of Justus in the Life of Josephus, sect 9; which also is a proof that it was published by the time Josephus composed the Life. The same conclusion follows still more clearly from the exordium of section 65*.

* Photius certainly affirms that Agrippa the younger died in the third of Trajan; and that the history of Justus ended there also. But it does not appear that he asserts the former fact on the authority of Justus *assuch*. In Eusebius, Chron. Arm.-Lat. ad ann. 2113, Justus is supposed to flourish in the first of Nerva. Combining these two authorities, we may perhaps infer, that there were *two* editions of his work; the *first* in the *last* of Domitian, the *second* in the *third* of Trajan: and the former, possibly, just after the *death* of Agrippa. If this was the case, Photius, writing from memory, might speak of the death of Agrippa, and the close of the history of Justus, as both coincident with the *third* of Trajan.

There is an allusion to Agrippa, Juvenal, vi. 156: Hunc dedit olim | Barbarus incestæ, dedit hunc Agrippa sorori, | Observant ubi festa mero pede sabbata reges, | Et vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis: which appears to me to imply that he was then dead. Hence if we knew the exact time when Juvenal was writing this satire, we should know before what time Agrippa was probably dead.

Juvenal certainly wrote after the death of Domitian: see Sat. iv. 37. 153. 154: and vii. 1-7, we may presume either in the reign of Nerva, or *early* in that of Trajan. Cf. Pliny, Panegyricus,

47. He mentions the military successes of Agricola, in Britain, ii. 159: Arma quidem ultra | Littora Jubernæ promovimus, et modo captas | Orcadas, ac minima contentos nocte Britannos: which were gained soon after U. C. 832, or U. C. 833: Dio, lxvi. 20. Tacitus, Agricola. But he is silent on the still more splendid successes of Trajan, which began to be gained so early as U. C. 854.

Juvenal is not among those writers whom Quintilian mentions, at least by name, as having distinguished themselves in satire: and Quintilian's Institutes, it may be shewn, were written about the middle of the reign of Domitian. Persius however is mentioned by him, x. i. 94: and in Persius also, v. 179, a reference occurs, as I am of opinion, to Agrippa; which very probably implies that he was then alive. It would be absurd to understand this allusion in the time of Persius, of any of the family of Herod besides, or of Herod himself. At cum | Herodis venere dies, unctaque fenestra | Dispositæ pinguem nebulam vomuere lucernæ, Labra moves tacitus, recutitaque sabbata palles. There is a note of time, Juv. xv. 27, and another xiii. 16, 17, which would agree together, if the former referred to the consulship of Q. Junius Rusticus, A. D. 119, and the latter to that of C. Fonteius

These inferences, respecting the true date of the suppression of the temple, appear to me to derive considerable support from the testimony of a contemporary, Pliny the elder. The *Historia Naturalis* of this author was completed, and dedicated to Titus Vespasian, in his sixth consulate, or directly after it; U.C. 830 or U.C. 831: *Triumphalis et Censorius tu, sexiesque Consul, ac Tribunitiæ potestatis particeps* *¹. If this proposition requires any proof, it may be established, I think, as follows.

H. N. xiv. 28. Tiberio Claudio Principe ante hos annos XL. institutum ut jejuni biberent †. The last

Capito, A.D. 59, just sixty years asunder.

The scholiast on Juv. xii. 76, 77, refers those words to the port of Ostia, as enlarged and rendered more secure, by Trajan. And there is one of Trajan's coins which commemorates some Portus Trajani; though Eckhel, vi. 426, on the authority of Pliny, Epp. vi. 31. sect. 1 and 16. *ad fin.*, thinks that this was rather Centum Cellæ, the modern Civita Vecchia, than Ostia.

These things seem to imply that all Juvenal's satires were written between the beginning of the reign of Trajan, and that of the reign of Hadrian. Suidas, indeed, Ἰουβενάλιος, would imply that he published his satires, some of them at least, under Domitian; for which he was banished by that emperor to the Pentapolis of Africa. But this account is evidently inaccurate in other respects; more especially in what relates to the

actor Paris; whom Domitian put to death, Dio, lxvii. 3: (Cf. Suet. Domitianus, 3:) instead of enriching and sending to Antioch; and who was buried in the via Flaminia, near Rome, see Martial, Epigrammatum xi. 13. and Dio, *loc. cit.*: instead of dying and being buried at Antioch. Salmasius, in short, contends that Juvenal was banished by Hadrian not by Domitian: though it is possible that Domitian might banish him, and yet none of his satires be published until after his return, in the reign of Nerva, when all exiles under Domitian, were permitted to come back. Dio, lxviii. 1.

* The preface to the *Historia Naturalis*, p. 15, informs us that the whole work was comprehended in thirty-six volumes, or books: the first book being reckoned exclusively: which proves that all of them were written before the preface.

† Cf. Lampridii Alexander Severus, 30.

¹ Præfatio ad Divum Vespasianum, p. 6.

year of Tiberius expired U.C. 790, March 16: and forty years from any time in that year cannot bring us to a later period than the same time, U.C. 830; much less forty years reckoned from U.C. 789; which would expire U.C. 829.

H.N. xxxvi. 24. §. 4. At hercule intra annos xxxv. eadem centesimum locum non obtinuit. Pliny is speaking of the increase of fine houses at Rome; so much so that, in thirty-five years, what had once been reputed at the head of the list did not rank within an hundred from the top. Now the progressive advancement of this species of luxury could scarcely be dated ἀπλῶς, as we see it to be dated by him, except from the beginning of some emperor's reign; and no such beginning could be just thirty-five years remote from the time when Pliny must have been writing, except that of the reign of Claudius. Accordingly, if we reckon forward thirty-five years from U.C. 794, the first of Claudius, it brings us to U.C. 829, the seventh of Vespasian.

Again, ii. 22, there is mention made of the appearance of a comet in the fifth consulate of Titus; that is, U.C. 829; which is described as the latest instance of the kind, up to the time when Pliny was writing. Moreover, vii. 50, the census, which was held by Vespasian and Titus in conjunction, is spoken of as having been held *intra quadriennium*; as referred to the same time. Now this census was concluded U.C. 827, in the fifth consulate of Vespasian, and the third of Titus^m; and it must have been begun U.C. 825 or 826, the year before that only; for if it was begun earlier, Pliny, who was writing within four years afterwards, would have been writing U.C. 828 at least; before the fifth consulate of Titus, not in it or after it. Ac-

^m Censorinus de Die Natali, 18.

cordingly the coins of Vespasian exhibit, among his other denominations, the title of Censor for these three years, U.C. 825, U.C. 826, and U.C. 827, but for these only *ⁿ: and *intra quadriennium* from the first of them must imply that Pliny was writing U.C. 829, and from the second, that he was writing U.C. 830 †.

It would appear then that Pliny was writing his Natural History in the years U.C. 829 and U.C. 830; or at least that he had finished and dedicated it to Titus by the latter year in particular. The preface could not have been composed until the whole was concluded; for it exhibits an analysis of the entire work, book by book and chapter by chapter; which must have been reserved for the last. And though Titus was *sexies consul* U.C. 830, he was not *septies consul* until U.C. 832, the year in which Vespasian died, and he himself succeeded to the throne. The month of August in that year, two months after he began to reign, was distinguished by the memorable eruption of Mount Vesuvius, in which Pliny himself lost his life^o.

Now xix. 2. §. 2. of the History an allusion occurs to Julius Lupus, who is spoken of as having been alive, *paulo ante*, and having died *in præfectura Ægypti*. This is unquestionably the same Lupus whose death, while he was still in office, is mentioned by Josephus; and who was succeeded by Paulinus. If Lupus, then,

* The coins in question shew that Vespasian assumed, and continued to bear, the title of censor, from U.C. 825—U.C. 827, inclusive.

† Nor is it any difficulty that the two Vespasians are alluded to, iii. 9, according to one reading, as emperors and cen-

sors still, U.C. 828; in the account of the measurement of the walls of Rome: for this might be U.C. 828 *incunte*, (which would be almost equivalent to U.C. 827 *exeunte*,) after the census as such was over. But Franzius reads this date U.C. 826, and not U.C. 828.

ⁿ Eckhel, *Doctrina Numm. Vett.* vi. 330—333. 344.

^o Pliny, *Epistolæ*, vi. 16.

was dead before the composition of this part of the *Historia Naturalis* of Pliny, he was dead before U.C. 830, and perhaps before U.C. 829; and his successor, Paulinus, we may justly presume, was in office at that very time. But Lupus, according to Josephus, was not dead before the reduction of Masada, U.C. 826; nor before the insurrection of the Jews in Egypt, posterior to that event; nor before the orders of Vespasian, arising out of this insurrection, to shut up the temple. He was not dead, then, as we may presume, before U. C. 827: yet he must have been dead by U. C. 829: and so critically at the time of the suppression of the temple, that its desecration, though begun by him, was completed only by his successor Paulinus. This seems to place it beyond a question, that the desecration of the temple could neither have begun earlier than U. C. 827, nor been carried into effect later than U.C. 828*.

* Josephus does not mention the fact that Vologeses the Parthian king applied to Vespasian for succours against the Alani: the refusal of which led to hostilities between them. Eckhel, vi. 333, 371, dates this application U.C. 828. Cf. Sueton. Domitianus, 2: Dio, lxvi. 15. Perhaps this omission also is some argument that Josephus' History of the War closes U. C. 827, or U.C. 828.

The date, which I have assigned to the close of the War, and to the memoirs of Josephus, is in accordance with the two following facts in his History. First, that he divorced his second wife P, (to whom he had been married at Alexandria, in the year before Titus laid siege to Jerusalem, consequently U.C.

822 *exeunte* 9;) not before the insurrection of Jonathan, nor before she had borne him three children. It is not probable these three children were all born under five years from the date of the marriage of their parents; and therefore, before U. C. 827 *exeunte* at least. The divorce of the mother, and the acquittal of Josephus from the calumnies of Jonathan, are apparently made to synchronize; and if both happened U.C. 827, or U.C. 828, this might well be the case.

Of the three children, which Josephus had by his second wife, Hyrcanus was born U.C. 825 or U. C. 826, in the fourth year of Vespasian; and Hyrcanus is called his eldest son: though whether ἀπλῶς the eldest, or with reference to his surviving

The temple of Onias is asserted by Jerome^s to have lasted two hundred and fifty years, usque ad imperium Vespasiani. ipsa autem urbs, quæ vocabatur Oniæ, dimicantibus postea adversus Romanos Judæis, ad solum usque deleta est: et neque urbis, neque templi, ullum restat vestigium. This date being seven years greater than 243 is erroneous for the reasons already stated: nor does Josephus assert the demolition, but only the desecration of the temple. I cannot help suspecting, however, that it was actually destroyed by command of Vespasian a year or two after, U.C. 830; though Josephus (whose History was finished before) does not mention that fact. We may be sure, at least, that it could not survive the war which was afterwards waged by the Jews of the same parts against the Romans, in the eighteenth or nineteenth of Trajan^t; when also, as well as at the time of its original suppression, by a remarkable coincidence, (if the text of Eusebius is not corrupt, and to be corrected for Lu-

children, may be doubtful. The eldest son by his third and last wife was born U.C. 828 or U.C. 829, in the seventh of Vespasian; the next to him, U.C. 830, or U.C. 831, in the ninth. I should conclude from these facts also, that he must have divorced his second wife at least in U.C. 827, and married his third either the same year, or early in the next. Vide Vita, 1. and 76.

Secondly, that Josephus was some time in the reign of Domitian accused before that emperor by the Jews; and yet absolved by him. These accusations were most probably instigated by the

persecution directed against the blood-royal among the Jews, who survived in the reign of Domitian: for Josephus, by the mother's side, was allied to the blood-royal himself. At the same time Domitian was persecuting Christianity; and the period of this persecution is ascertained by the death of Flavius Clemens, one of its victims, and consul ἐπώνυμος at the time^r. Flavius Clemens was consul U.C. 848. Domitian was assassinated September 18, in the next year; whence we may infer the persecution was begun U.C. 847.

^r Dio, lxxvii. 14. Suet. Domitians, 12. 15. Eusebius, E. H. iii. 17—20.
^s Operum iii. 1125. *ad princip.* in Dan. xi. ^t Eusebius, E. H. iv. 2.

sus*,) one Lupus is said to have been the præfect of Egypt.

Reland has produced in his Palestine the following passage from the Midrash Ruth^v; Quamdiu latebit ille? that is, the Messiah. R. Tanchuma dicit, nomine doctorum—dies XLV. Now from U. C. 783, when the publication of the Gospel to the Jews began, to U. C. 828, the time of the consummation predicted, there is just this number of years.

Lastly, if, as Jerome repeatedly observes^w, the interval of forty years, or the number forty in general,

* Yet Eusebius, *loco citato*, distinguishes Lusius Quietus by name from Lupus. Marcus Antoninus, De Rebus Suis, xii. 27, enumerates Lusius Lupus along with others; which, if the text is not corrupt, and to be corrected by Lucius, would prove that there was some one who bore the name of Lusius Lupus, as well as another, who bore that of Lusius Quietus. The same passage implies that this Lusius Lupus either lived or died at Baïæ; which last circumstance would effectually distinguish him from Lusius Quietus, if it be true, as Spartian, Hadriani 7, tells us, this Lusius was put to death, early in the reign of Hadrian, and when upon the road, (*in itinere*,) to some quarter or other, *invito Adriano*. Cf. Dio, lxviii. 32. lxi. 2. A Lusius is mentioned as an illustrious commander under Trajan, like Corbulo under Nero, by Ammianus Marcellinus, xxix. 5. p. 569: whence we may infer that this is the Lusius, who was commanding

with Trajan, at the end of the first Dacian war, about U. C. 855 or U. C. 856: Dio, lxviii. 8. 32: and in the Parthian or Armenian wars of Trajan, U. C. 868. Dio, lxviii. 30. 25. 26.

The truth appears to me to be, that at the death of Trajan, Lusius Quietus was governor of Mauritania, and Lusius Lupus either then, or previously, the governor of Egypt: see Spartian, Hadriani 5. Lusius Quietus might be instrumental on that occasion, in suppressing the Jews about Cyrene, and Lusius Lupus those in Egypt; and when Turbo superseded Quietus in Africa, Spartian, Hadriani 5. 6. 9, the rebellion might then be over.

Lusius Quietus was the more distinguished character in the reign, at least, of Trajan. Spartian, Hadriani 7. 9, he was vir Consularis at the time of his death; and it would seem his being put to death, *in itinere*, was when he was on his way back from Mauritania to Italy.

^v i. 353.

^w Operum iii. 907. *ad calc.*: 996. *ad princ.*: 1385. *ad calc.*: 1487. *ad princ.* A similar remark occurs in Origen: Operum ii. 391. D. E. Selecta in Deuteronomium.

seems to be especially appropriated to the suspension, previous to the execution, of the penal dispensations of Providence—as the term of probation—as the measure of God's longsuffering—as the interval devoted to warning and denunciation with a view to repentance ; and in defect of that, the period after which the punishment of obstinate impenitence should begin : then, I shall perhaps be excused, if I point out the following coincidences ; all of which will hold good upon the admission of our principles, but on no other whatever.

From the feast of Tabernacles, U. C. 779, when the ministry of John the Baptist was begun, to the feast of Tabernacles, U. C. 819, when Cestius Gallus laid siege to Jerusalem, there were just forty years : from U. C. 783, when the dispensation of the Gospel to the Jews exclusively first began, to U. C. 823, almost at the same time, when the temple and city of Jerusalem were destroyed, there were also forty years ; and from U. C. 790, when the Gospel ceased to be preached to the Jews exclusively, to the time when I have rendered it probable that the temple of Onias, in Egypt, was actually destroyed ; and consequently after which there was not a vestige of practical Judaism, such as had existed until then, any where left in the world ; which time I have supposed was U. C. 829 or U. C. 830 ; there were also just forty years. The first two of these coincidences are certain ; and the last cannot be disproved, or shewn to be absolutely precarious. The shutting up of the temple of Onias was not its destruction ; but it was a kind of prelude to it : and as I have shewn that the former must have taken place in U. C. 827, or U. C. 828, so might the latter in U. C. 829, or U. C. 830.

DISSERTATION XVI.

On the two genealogies.

THE apparent discrepancy of the genealogies naturally excited discussion even in the earliest ages ; and though there is one method of solution which satisfactorily explains this discrepancy, and that method is not more satisfactory than simple and obvious ; yet the adversaries of Christianity, so far back as the time of Celsus, have always been ready to lay hold on this particular instance of seeming contradiction, as one of the most prominent and most triumphant, which the Gospel history furnishes*.

* Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 32: *Operum* i. 413. D. E : it does not appear, indeed, that Celsus attacked the genealogies on the score of any inconsistency with each other. He charged the authors of them with having fabricated their accounts ; ἀπηνυθαδῆσθαι τοὺς γενεαλογήσαντας ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου φυντὸς, καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰουδαίῳ βασιλέων, τὸν Ἰησοῦν. καὶ οἰεταί, continues Origen, τι εἰσφέρειν γενναῖον, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν ἡ τοῦ τέκτονος γυνή, τηλικούτου γένους τυγχάνουσα, ἡγνόει. It is clear that this criticism applies more to the genealogy of St. Luke than to that of St. Matthew ; because the former only carries up the descent of Christ, through the kings of Israel, to the first man : and the last objection, as we may observe by the way, proves also that Celsus understood the genealogy in question to be that of our Saviour's mother ; or as he calls

her, ἡ τοῦ τέκτονος γυνή. Yet by speaking of those who had given the genealogy of Jesus, in the plural number ; he recognises St. Matthew's, as well as St. Luke's.

The emperor Julian, however, made their apparent inconsistency a specific ground of attack. Hieronymus, *Operum* iv. Pars i. 7 *ad princip.* in Matt. i. : Hoc loco objecit nobis Julianus Augustus dissonantiam Evangelistarum : cur Evangelista Matthæus Joseph dixerit filium Jacob, et Lucas eum filium appellarit Heli : non intelligens consuetudinem Scripturarum, quod alter secundum naturam, alter secundum legem ei pater sit. Vide Cyrillum contra Julianum, viii. 253. E. who has given us the words of Julian—and Augustini et Fausti Disputatio, lib. iii. cap. i : *Operum* viii. 189 : where Faustus also objects to the same

If the genealogies are really distinct, there may after all be no contradiction between them : and as this appears to me the true state of the case, I shall mention a few of the considerations, which contribute to render it *a priori* probable, and are applicable to both of them in conjunction ; before I speak of either in particular.

First ; the necessity of some genealogy of our Lord in general must be evident : for if he was the predicted Messiah of the Jews, whose birth and descent had been fixed long before to a certain line ; the fulfilment of the prophecy in his person could not be made apparent but by exhibiting his descent accordingly. That their genealogical records were still preserved among the Jews, after as well as before the Babylonish captivity, is too notorious a fact to require proof^a. The numerous family notices, which occur in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah^b, *passim*, were doubtless extracted from such records ; and so late even as the reign of Domitian, when Josephus composed his own Memoirs^c, he is still found appealing, in proof of his extraction, to the δημόσiai δέλτοι, as yet in existence, and as yet open to inspection.

Again ; as our Saviour's parents, whether both really or both nominally such, or the one really, the other only reputed so ; were necessarily distinct individuals, his descent might be exhibited through either ; and as traced through the one it must necessarily differ from the same descent traced through the other. Yet either would be truly an account of his descent, as much as the other.

Again ; if Joseph was really the father of our Lord, discrepancy—in order to prove ing the supposed humanity of the Manichæan notion concern- Christ as God.

^a Jos. Vita, i. Contra Apionem, i. 7.
xxxi. 16—19. Neh. vii. 5.

^b 1 Chron. ix. 1—22. 2 Chron.
Ant. Jud. xx. xi. 2.

^c

the genealogy of Joseph, according to the flesh, must be the genealogy of our Lord, in the same respect; and it would be superfluous to search for any other. But if Joseph was not really the father of our Lord; that is, if the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation be scriptural and true—a doctrine which St. Matthew confirms as plainly as St. Luke—the genealogy of Joseph, according to the flesh, could in nowise be the similar genealogy of Christ. Now the genealogy, which is given by St. Matthew, is obviously the genealogy of Joseph, according to the flesh. The use of the assertion ἐγέννησε between its several links, from first to last, admits of no other conclusion. If so, it could not be the genealogy of Christ in the natural sense. But it might still be his genealogy in some other sense; as reputed, for instance, the son of Joseph; that is, as naturally the son of the wife of Joseph. It might be therefore his genealogy in a civil or political sense. Accordingly, the same Evangelist, who so clearly propounds it as the natural genealogy of Joseph, does by no means propound it as the natural genealogy of Christ; for when he is arrived at the name of Joseph, instead of continuing, as he had begun, and as he had proceeded all along until then, Ἰωσήφ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν—he changes his language in a striking manner; Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσήφ, ΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΜΑΡΙΑΣ ΕΞ ΗΣ ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. It is evident then, that he intended the previous line to stop short with Joseph, or not to pass on to Christ, except as the son of Mary whose husband was Joseph. Nor is this all; but, if the words be rightly translated, it is further implied by them that Joseph did not become the husband of Mary, until after the birth, or at least the conception, of Christ: And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom had been born, *or*

had been conceived, Jesus who is called Christ. That this is a possible meaning of ἐγεννήθη, I have no hesitation in affirming.

Again; the genealogy of St. Matthew not being the genealogy of Christ according to the flesh, the general reason, alluded to already, required some other to be left on record, which should be his genealogy according to the flesh. Now any genealogy distinct from that of his reputed father, must be the genealogy of his real mother. St. Luke has exhibited such a genealogy. St. Luke's genealogy therefore may be the natural genealogy of Mary; but cannot be the natural genealogy of Joseph.

Again; if, as it has been asserted, it was not the custom of the Jews to exhibit the genealogy of females, as such*; that is to say, to deduce a particular line of descent from a female as its head, or to trace one back to one; the truth of which assertion, generally speaking, is incontestable: the genealogy of Christ, as descended from Mary, would not be formally exhibited as his genealogy *through* Mary, but as his genealogy through some one most closely connected with Mary; that is to say, through some one who stood, or might be considered to stand in the same relation to the father of Mary, as Mary herself. Now this could be none but her husband Joseph, to whom she was already con-

* Eusebius ad Stephanum, Quæstiones Evangelicæ, i. SS. Deperditorum Vaticana Coll. i. Pars i. 9. D: πλὴν ἄλλ' οἱ θαυμάσιοι εὐαγγελισταὶ ἀναγκαίως τότε παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἐγενεαλόγουν, αὐτὸν ἐκείνους τὸν παρὰ πᾶσι βοώμενον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πατέρα· εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο παρελθόντες μητρόθεν αὐτὸν ἐγενεαλόγουν, πρὸς τῷ καὶ ἀπρεπὲς

εἶναι τοῦτο, καὶ τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν εὐηθείας (συνηθείας) ἀλλότριον, ὅτι μηδεὶς τὸ πρότερον ἐκ γυναικὸς γενεαλογηθεὶς ἱστορεῖται, ἔδοξεν ἂν ἀπάτωρ τις εἶναι, καὶ δυσγενὴς, ὁ γενεαλογούμενος: Cf. Theophylact, Operum i. 6. D. E: in Matt. i: and Chrysostom in the parallel passage.

tracted, before the birth of Christ ; and to whom she was actually united in marriage at the time of it.

It ought to excite no surprise, therefore, if the genealogy of Mary, regarded as the genealogy of our Lord, were exhibited nominally as the genealogy of Joseph. It will follow only from this fact that, as the *natural* genealogy of Joseph, distinct from Mary's, is exhibited by St. Matthew as the *legal* genealogy of Jesus ; so the *natural* genealogy of Jesus, distinct from Joseph's, is exhibited by St. Luke, as the *legal* genealogy of Joseph. The language of the latter Evangelist is as much adapted to the confirmation of this conclusion, as the language of St. Matthew to the support of the former. For first, the words $\omega\upsilon\acute{\nu}\ \omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\iota\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$, premised to the account, by setting forth our Lord merely as the *reputed*, and not as the *actual* son of Joseph, do clearly imply that the genealogy which follows, apparently *through* Joseph, cannot be the natural genealogy of them both ; and if it is a real genealogy in respect to either of them, it can be only an imputed one in respect of the other. Secondly, the mode of expressing the relation between the successive links in this genealogy, seems purposely chosen to describe an acquired as well as a natural relation ; for it is such as to apply to both. This appears most distinctly at the end of all, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{'Αδὰμ},\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Θεοῦ}$. It is equally possible, then, of the links at the beginning, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{'Ιωσήφ},\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{'Ηλί}$; and of any intermediate step, as $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Σαλαθιήλ},\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Νηρί}$.

Again ; we have but to suppose that Mary the mother of our Lord, was the daughter of Eli and the wife of Joseph ; and we assign a reason why the descent of our Lord, though in reality *through* Mary, might yet be set forth apparently *through* Joseph. Tradition seems to have perpetuated thus much ; viz. that the

names of the Virgin's parents were Joachim (which is but another form for Eliachim, or for Eli) and Anna*; which so far agrees with the above supposition. And though, if the fact of their marriage be admitted, we are not in strictness concerned with the further question, how Joseph the son of Jacob came to be contracted to Mary the daughter of Eli; yet if we may also suppose, what I think is very probable, that Mary was the only child of Eli, and that Joseph was the next of kin to her, then the Law of Moses would require their union.

Nor can it be objected to this supposition that the particular provision, by which heiresses were forbidden to match themselves out of their tribe, was no longer in force, or no longer capable of being observed. It could not cease to be in force, so long as the Law itself was in being; and as to its observance—if the distinctions of tribes and families continued to be kept up, it was not only practicable but requisite: and while there was any kind of property to transmit, whether that was a family landed inheritance or not, it might still regulate the transmission of that. It is certain that, as both descended from David, Joseph and Mary were of kin; and as each standing at an analogous point in the lines of this descent, it is probable that they were the next of kin to one another. It is probable also that Mary was an orphan at the time of the annunciation; or that her parents were then dead: and though she was already espoused to Joseph, it may almost be presumed to be certain that she was much younger than

* Epiphanius, *Operum* i. 1049. D. Antidico-marianitæ, xvii: 1062. C. D. Collyridiani v: *Operum* ii. 292. A. Cf. Procopius, *De Ædificiis*, i. cap. 3. 12. B. C. Joannes Damascenus, *De Orthodoxa Fide*, iv. cap. 91. Co-

dex Apocryphus *Novi Testamenti*, 19: *Evangelium De Nativitate Mariæ*, caput i: 67. *Prot-evangelium Jacobi*, cap. i. and ii. Cf. also the *Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi*, 197—199. *Protevan-gelium Jacobi*, i and ii.

he. We have seen elsewhere^d, that the most usual age of marriage for females in Judæa was from fourteen to sixteen; and the canon of Hippolytus, quoted on a former occasion^e, places the annunciation accordingly, in the fourteenth year of the age of Mary*. The age of Joseph at the same period, if Epiphanius is to be credited^f, was not less than eighty: and though we may very well hesitate to believe this assertion in particular, yet there is reason to suppose that he was more than arrived at man's estate, and was even considerably advanced in years. Joseph was certainly alive when our Lord was twelve years old^g; but I think that he was not alive when our Lord was thirty^h: whereas the Virgin Mary was alive at the crucifixionⁱ, and if tradition is to be believed^k, for fifteen years at least afterwards. It would seem then, that Joseph did not survive the annunciation more than thirty years, and he might survive it much less; whereas the Virgin is believed to have survived it at least forty-eight. We may take it for granted therefore, that he was an old man, and she was still a young woman, at the time of that event; which disparity of age, if it be rightly assumed, is among the strongest presumptive arguments that they were espoused to each other as the next of kin.

* Cf. the Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, i. 29: Evangelium De Nativitate Mariæ, capp. vii—ix. The Protevangelium Jacobi, cap. viii and xii. (Ibid. i. 85. 95.) makes Mary twelve at the time of her espousals, and sixteen at the annunciation. The same Protevangelium, apud Auctarium Codicis Apocry-

phi, 209. 218. cap. viii and xii. makes her twelve at the former, fourteen at the latter of these periods. The same may be said of the Historia Josephi, caput iii. iv. xiv. Codex Pseudepigraphus, ii. 315. 316. 322. This same Historia, cap. x. 319. cap. xv. 322; makes Joseph one hundred and eleven years old at his death.

^d Vol. i. 398—400. Dissertation xii.
^f Operum i. 432. D: 1040. A—C: 1042. A.
 ii. 12. ⁱ Ib. xix. 25—27.

^e Supra, p. 20. Dissertation xv.
^g Luke ii. 41—51. ^h John

^k Vol. i. 152. Dissertation ii.

The hypothesis of Julius Africanus, which is the earliest attempt to reconcile the genealogies, on record, though it professes to be grounded on tradition, and makes Joseph naturally the son of Jacob, and only by adoption the son of Eli, is liable to this great objection; viz. that it supposes Eli to die childless, and Jacob, the father of Joseph, to marry his widow, and to raise up seed to Eli in Joseph¹. In this case the Virgin Mary herself is not recognised as the daughter of Eli; and neither genealogy proves directly that our Lord was descended from David*.

* There is an extract from Africanus' explanation of the genealogies, in the *Quæstiones Evangelicæ ad Stephanum*, *Quæstio iv*; a work of Eusebius', part of which has been restored in the *SS. Deperditorum Vaticana Collectio*, of Angelus Maius, tom. i. It is of course similar to what is given from the same author in the *Ecclesiastical History*: but, as it sums up the statements of Africanus in brief, I will lay the conclusion of it before the reader here. Page 21-23.

Ἰνα δὲ σαφὲς ᾖ τὸ λεγόμενον, τὴν ἐπαλλαγὴν τῶν γενῶν διηγήσομαι. ἡ κατὰ φύσιν γένεσις ἐστὶ Ματθαίου· ἡ κατὰ νόμον ἀνάστασις γένους ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ Λουκᾶ. Ματθὰν ὁ ἀπὸ Σολομῶνος ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ· Ματθὰν ἀποθανόντος, Μελχὶ ὁ ἀπὸ Ναθὰν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς γυναικὸς ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἡλὶ. ὁμομήτριοι ἀδελφοὶ Ἡλὶ καὶ Ἰακώβ. Ἡλὶ ἀτέκνου ἀποθανόντος ὁ Ἰακώβ ἀνέστησεν αὐτῷ σπέρμα, γεννήσας τὸν Ἰωσήφ, κατὰ φύσιν μὲν ἑαυτῷ, κατὰ νόμον δὲ τῷ Ἡλὶ. οὕτως ἀμφοτέρων υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ.

Besides the difficulty, con-

nected with this explanation, already mentioned; it would be a further objection that, on this principle, the name of Joseph ought not to have appeared in the genealogy of St. Matthew, as the son of Jacob. If Jacob, by the law of Levirate, married the widow of Heli, and raised up seed to him; the offspring of that marriage belonged to the family of Heli; and in all the genealogical records of both families, the name of Joseph would appear as the son of Heli, not of Jacob.

Joannes Damascenus, *De Orthodoxa Fide*, lib. iv. cap. 91, proposes a scheme for the reconciliation of the two genealogies, which is, briefly stated, as follows: Levi of the line of Nathan, begat Melchi and Panther; Panther, Bar-panther, and Bar-panther, Joachim, who married Anna, and was by her the father of Mary.

Matthan, of the line of Solomon, begat Jacob, and died. Melchi, the son of Levi, married his widow, and begat Eli. Jacob and Eli were thus uterine brothers. Eli died childless:

¹ Eusebius, *E. H.* i. vii. 23. C. D.

If then it be asked why St. Matthew has given the genealogy of Joseph, as the genealogy of Christ, knowing it to be merely his civil but not his natural line of descent; it may be answered, first, that if the Jewish records did not recognise Mary, though the daughter of Eli, except as the wife of Joseph, her son, who would appear to be *his* son, must be described accordingly. Secondly, the final end of any genealogical account of Christ being merely to shew his lineal descent from David; if the Virgin Mary was really ἐπίκλητος παρθένος, and married to Joseph as the next of kin, this end would be answered by the line of Joseph, as well as by the line of Mary. The wife of Joseph under such circumstances must have been descended from David, as well as he. Thirdly, what is perhaps the true reason, St. Matthew, writing exclusively for the Jews, and proposing our Saviour as *their* Messiah; confined his line to David and Abraham accordingly, with a view more particularly to establish his title, as the βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, and in that capacity, his right to the temporal kingdom of Israel.

This temporal kingdom at first was undoubtedly assured to Solomon, and to his posterity according to the flesh^m; and though this promise seems to have been revoked in the person of Coniah or Jeconiah, the grandson of Josiah, and even before that in the person of Jehoiakim, the father of Coniahⁿ; yet a contemporary prophecy relating to the last king Zedekiah^o, and another prophecy of Jeremiah himself^p, will shew

Jacob married his widow, and raised up seed to him in Joseph. Joseph and Mary were thus next of kin to each other, and so were espoused. This scheme appears to be founded on that of Africanus.

^m 2 Sam. vii. 12—16. 1 Kings i. 13. 30. ix. 5. 1 Chron. xvii. 11—14. xxii. 7—10. xxviii. 5. ⁿ Jer. xxii. 10. 12. 24. 25—27. 28—30. xxii. 13—19. xxxvi. 30. ^o Ezek. xxi. 25—27. ^p xxxiii. 17—end. The time of this prophecy was in or after the *tenth* of Zedekiah: see xxxiii. 1. xxxii. 1. 2.

that it was not absolutely revoked, but merely for a time suspended. It was taken away from the present possessor, Shallum, Jehoiakim, Coniah, or Zedekiah, but only to be reserved until *he* should come whose right it was : and to him it should be restored. This person was doubtless the Christ ; and his right, as entitled to the crown of Israel, must be as derived from David. For this reason St. Matthew has traced up his descent through the line of Solomon ; because the promise of the temporal kingdom was originally assured to David in the person of Solomon. The right conveyed by that promise, and transmitted through the descendants of Solomon, had now been centred in Joseph ; and through Joseph became vested in Christ : a result which remained still the same, in whatever sense our Saviour were considered the son, provided he were the *πρωτότοκος* of Joseph. Nor is it any objection that the temporal kingdom has not yet been actually restored to the descendants of David, in the person of Christ. It may be restored hereafter ; and that is sufficient for the end in view. But the genealogy of St. Luke, which beginning with Jesus, proceeds up to Adam, can have no object except to represent Christ as the promised seed of the woman, in whom all the nations of the earth were interested alike. It is such a genealogy, therefore, as was to be expected from a Gospel written expressly for Gentiles ; and not for Jews.

I shall now pass to a few observations on each of the genealogies in particular.

First, the descent of the Messiah having been gradually restricted, from Abraham downwards, to the line of Isaac and afterwards of Jacob ; became fixed at last to one tribe in the line of Judah, and to one family in the line of David. From the time of David, then, the line of the Messiah was necessarily to be deduced

through the posterity of David : amongst whom, if the promise of his descent through them was confined to any in particular, it was so to the children of David and Bathsheba^q. The most eminent of this number was unquestionably Solomon. But the promise of the Messiah, according to the flesh, is nowhere restricted to the line of Solomon : and amongst the children of David and Bathsheba, Nathan is mentioned as well as he^r. St. Luke's genealogy is derived from Nathan : St. Matthew's from Solomon. If, indeed, the tradition which is mentioned by Africanus^s, that Matthan the father of Jacob, and Melchi the father of Eli, were both at different times married to the same wife, whom he calls *Estha*, were true ; then Jacob and Eli, as he supposes, would be brothers : and if Estha herself was descended from David, Jacob might also be related to Nathan, or Eli might also be related to Solomon : in which case the same things would hold good of Joseph the son of Jacob, and of Mary the daughter of Eli. I confess that there appears to me some reason for this tradition ; partly because it specifies the name of Estha, and partly because it brings the connection between Joseph and Mary still closer than before : for they were thus the children of brothers by the same mother, but not by the same father ; and consequently they were cousins of each other.

Again ; it is probable that neither genealogy stands exactly as it came from the writer of the Gospel ; and in the mere transcription of names, errors of excess or of defect are things of too common occurrence, and too often exemplified in other instances, to create any surprise here. The number of kings in direct descent from David to Jeconiah, the last king of Judah but

^q 1 Chron. xxii. 7—10. Psalm lxxii. lxxxix. 3, 4. 20—37. cxxxii. 11—end.
^r 1 Chron. iii. 5. ² Sam. xi. 3. ^s Supra, Eusebius, loc. cit.

one, including them both is nineteen^t: in St. Matthew it is but fifteen; and it is evident that, between Joram and Uzzias, in his account, there are omitted three names in succession, Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah; and between Josias and Jechonias, that the intermediate name of Jehoiakim, the father of Jechonias, is also wanting. The certainty of omissions in the first half of the list, between David and Jechonias, is presumptively proof of omissions in the last half, between Zerubbabel and Joseph.

St. Luke's genealogy contains at present, from Jesus to God, seventy-seven names; and it contained the same number in the time of Jerome^u. Yet there is authority from Africanus^v to expunge the two names, between Eli and Melchi, viz. Matthat and Levi; (for he writes in this order, τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, τοῦ Ἑλὶ, τοῦ Μελλ-*χι*;) which reduces the whole number to seventy-five; and another name, in the second Cainan, between Salah and Arphaxad^w; which also he does not recognise; whereby the number is reduced to seventy-four. In the time of Irenæus, however, a more ancient writer than Africanus, the whole number was only seventy-two *^x.

* With regard to the general question of the number of steps between Adam and Christ, that is, of the exact amount of the names contained in the genealogy of St. Luke; I consider it exceedingly probable that the true number is this of seventy-two. Irenæus' testimony is very explicit, that he knew of no more: Propter hoc Lucas genealogiam, quæ est a generatione Domini nostri usque ad Adam, *septuaginta duas* generationes habere ostendit, finem conjun-

gens initio, et significans quoniam ipse est qui omnes gentes exinde ab Adam dispersas, et universas linguas, et generationem hominum cum ipso Adam in semetipso recapitulatus est.

There is here a reference to the supposed coincidence between the number of generations in the genealogy of our Lord from Adam downwards, and that of the languages or families of mankind, at the dispersion: which the Fathers currently speak of as exactly se-

^t 1 Chron. iii. 1—22.

^u Epistolæ Criticæ, Operum ii. 565. *ad princip.*

^v Eusebius, loc. cit. or Reliquiæ Sacræ, ii. i. ii. 114—123.

^w Ibid. ii. ix. 130.

^x Adversus Hær. iii. cap. 33. 261. l. 1—9.

We must reduce it therefore by two more; which two, as I should conjecture, are the second $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ Ματ-

venty-two: Vide Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 404. l. 16—18. Epiphanius, i. v. 6. D: 288. D. Sethiani, vii: Operum ii. 181. D. De Mensuris et Ponderibus, xxiv: Augustin, de Civitate Dei, xvi. iii. 2: Operum vii. 418. C: and vi. 2. Ibid. 421. C. &c. Nor are they the Fathers of the church only who thus speak. A similar tradition appears in Horapollon, Hieroglyphica, i. 14. page 28.

This reference alone is a sufficient voucher for the accuracy of the numeral reading in Irenæus, if there were any reason to call it in question; as the analogy has no existence except on the supposition that the number of generations, like that of tongues and families, was just seventy-two.

If Africanus had had occasion to specify the entire amount of generations in St. Luke's genealogy; then, as he certainly excludes *three*, which at present appear in it, I think there is great reason to suppose his testimony would have agreed with that of Irenæus, as to the entire amount.

With respect to Origen, I am not aware that he has mentioned the sum total of the generations in question, in any part of his works which have come down to us: but there is little doubt that he did not recognise *one* of the steps, which St. Luke's genealogy exhibits at present; viz. the name of the second Cainan: Vide Operum ii. 282. E. F: in Numeros Hom. iv: Operum iii. 701. C: in Matt. tom. xv. 34: Operum iv.

309. D. 310. A: in Joh. tom. xx. 3. Nor was this, because he was not acquainted with its existence, but because he considered it spurious; for Procopius of Gaza informs us that in his edition of the Old Testament, the *obelus*, or mark of spurious, was attached to the name in question.

As to this name in particular, it was not known to Josephus; and, besides the numerous ancient versions which do not exhibit it, the Samaritan, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, Persian; amongst the most ancient Christian writers, Theophilus ad Autolycom, iii. 24. 368, omits all mention of it: the Recognitiones, ascribed to Clement, could not have been acquainted with it (vide lib. i. 29, 30, 31: PP. Apostolici, 407: and lib. iv. 27, 28): Eusebius, as well as Africanus, distinctly disclaimed it: Epiphanius, though he sometimes mentions or implies it; (as i. 5. C; 8. A; 9. B; 704. B: Manichæi, lxxxiv: Operum ii. 62. A: Ancoratus, lix. and 118. C. cxvi: 179. D: De Mensuris et Ponderibus, xxii:) yet in other instances passes it over (as i. 473. A: Melchisedeciani, vi: 1081. C: Expositio fidei, iv). The Hypomnesticon or Liber Sacer Memorialis of Joseph, an ancient Christian author, supposed to be mentioned by Epiphanius, omits it also: lib. i. cap. 1. Codex Pseudepigraphus, 3. Theodorit also (iv. 104: Dialogus ii. Inconfusus) reckons it *twenty* generations from Adam to Abraham; which excludes the second Cainan.

θατ, τοῦ Λευι, in verse 29, coming between τοῦ Ἰωρεὶμ, and τοῦ Συμεὼν. With these five omissions the number of degrees is exactly seventy-two: and there is this further reason for the last omission, that without the two names, τοῦ Ματθαῖ, τοῦ Λευι, the number of

To return, however, from this digression. Prudentius, who was born A. D. 348: *Operum* i. 358: *Apotheosis*, 1002, confirms the preceding authorities by shewing that the number of names in his time was still only seventy-two. *Quid, quum sanctilocus revoluto germine Lucas | Sursum versus agit seriem, scandente nepotis | Corpore, perque atavos cursum relegente vetustos, | Septenos decies conscendit Christus in ortus | Et duo: nam totidem doctores misit in orbem.* Gregory Nazianzen, *De Christi Genealogia*, *Carmen* xxxviii: and Ambrose, *Comm.* in *Lucam* iii, (*Operum* iii. 55. 56) omit the two names of Matthat and Levi between those of Heli and Melchi. The latter twice repeats the assertion that the number of generations between Heli and Abraham was fifty. The number of names, in the genealogy, as it stands in the vulgate, is fifty-three. It appears indeed that Ambrose's statement is meant of fifty in round numbers: for, in another part of his *Commentary* on *Luke* iii, he explains it to consist of ten, and seven, thrice repeated, that is, 30, 21, or 51 in all; as it would be in the vulgate, without the two names in question. The *Liber Memorialis*, or *Hypomnesticon* of Joseph, before alluded to, *loco citat.*, makes the number of generations from Adam to Christ, seventy: taking St. Luke's order from Adam to David, with the ex-

ception of the second Cainan; St. Matthew's, from David to Zorobabel, only inserting three names between Joram and Ozias, verse 9, viz. Ochozias, Joas, and Amasias; and St. Luke's again from Zorobabel to Joseph, omitting one of the names, verse 26. Maath or Mattathias.

Augustin, *Operum* i. 44. E. F: *Retractationes*, ii. vii. 2, may be considered to omit the two names above mentioned also: insomuch as he there quotes and approves of Africanus' mode of reconciling the genealogies, which proceeded on the principle of the omission in question. Cf. also cap. xii. 46. B. C. These *Retractationes* are among the latest of Augustin's works. Elsewhere, as it must be confessed, he both acknowledges the second Cainan, and supposes the whole number of generations from Adam to Christ to be seventy-seven: *Vide Operum* iii. *Pars* i. 407. F: *Quæstiones in Genesim*, i. cxxi: 456. A. ii. cviii: 572. D—573. G: v. xlvi: *Operum* iii. *Pars* 2^{da}. 32. D: *De Consensu Evangelistarum* ii. 12: also 251: *Quæstiones Evangeliorum*, ii. vi: *Operum* v. 300. F: *Sermo*, li. 33: 449. *Sermo*, lxxxiii. 5: *Operum* vii. 417. F. *De Civitate Dei*, xvi. iii. 2: and many other places.

Julius Pollux. *Chronicon*, 57, Christ is supposed the seventy-seventh from Adam, yet (page 67. 1.) the second Cainan is not mentioned.

steps from David to Neri in St. Luke, inclusive of both, is exactly nineteen; which is also the number of steps from David to Jechonias in St. Matthew. Now Neri and Jechonias must have been contemporaries; for Salathiel stands in the same relation of son to each: and it is not unlikely that, between each of them and David, the common founder of either line, the number of generations would be equal. The same thing is asserted by Josephus of the number of the high priests, from the high priest contemporary with Solomon, who was Zadok, to Josadak contemporary with Jechonias^y. This number was eighteen; which, beginning at Solomon, answers to nineteen, beginning at David.

From the birth of Solomon^z, which the Bible Chronology places B. C. 1033, to the birth of Jeconias^a, eighteen years before his captivity, B. C. 599, there are 416 years; which, divided by seventeen, the number of descents between Solomon and Jeconias, leaves about twenty-four years and an half for the average interval between each step. A similar interval is reckoned by Josephus, in the supposed succession of eighteen high priests, at 466 years^y; which is an average of twenty-five or twenty-six. Most of the kings of Judah had children early. It admits of proof that Solomon was only seventeen at the birth of Rehoboam; Joram only eighteen at the birth of Ahaziah; Ahaziah and Joash only twenty-two at the birth of Joash and of Amaziah respectively; Jotham only twenty-one at the birth of Ahaz; Ahaz only twelve at the birth of Hezekiah; Amon only sixteen at the birth of Josiah; Josiah only fourteen at the birth of Jehoiakim; and Jehoiakim only eighteen at the birth of Jeconiah. In the remaining instances the interval is much greater. Jehoshaphat

^y Ant. Jud. xx. x.
xxxvi. 8—10.

^z 2 Sam. xii. 24.

^a 2 Kings xxiv. 8. 2 Chron.

was twenty-eight at the birth of Joram ; Amaziah was thirty-eight at the birth of Uzziah ; Uzziah was forty-three at the birth of Jotham ; Hezekiah was forty-two at the birth of Manasseh ; Manasseh was forty-five at the birth of Amon.

St. Matthew asserts that Jechonias begat Salathiel *after* or *during* the removal to Babylon. Jechonias was but eighteen years old when he went into captivity^b ; and though his wives are mentioned as carried into captivity along with him, his sons or his children are not^c—whence we may conclude that he had no children then. Yet, Jer. xxii. 28—a prophecy, which it appears was delivered after he was gone into captivity—an allusion occurs to his seed ; that is, to his seed begotten in captivity. Compare also verse 30. Accordingly it appears that he had eight sons^d ; the eldest Assir, and the next to him Salathiel. In the thirty-seventh year of his captivity, that is, B.C. 563, and in the fifty-fifth of his age, Evil-Merodach released him from confinement^e. But though he might not be too old to have children even after that time, Salathiel in particular could not be of that number ; for in this case Salathiel himself would not have been more than twenty-six, B. C. 536, in the last year of the Babylonish captivity ; the return from which was conducted by his son Zerubbabel—if Zerubbabel, at least, was his son : which St. Matthew's expression ἐγέννησε, and Ezra iii. 2. Nehem. xii. 1. Haggai i. 1. 12. 14. ii. 1*, &c. place beyond a doubt. Both in Josephus^f, and in the Seventy, Salathiel is but another form for Shealtiel. Salathiel then was not born before

* So likewise 1 Esdras v. 5. 48.

^b 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9. 10. 2 Kings xxiv. 8—16.
xxix. 2. xxii. 26. ^d 1 Chron. iii. 17, 18.

^c 2 Kings xxiv. 15. Jer.
^e 2 Kings xxv. 27. ^f Ant.

Jud. xi. iii. 10.

B. C. 599, nor after B. C. 563 : and B. C. 536, had a son arrived at man's estate, and able to conduct the return of his countrymen. He must have been born then soon after B. C. 599.

In one place of his Antiquities, Josephus asserts that David reigned, and bequeathed the sovereignty to his children, for twenty-one generations^g; in another, that the kings of the race of David, from the first to the last, were twenty-one in number^h. Between David and Zedekiah there were certainly twenty-one kings, inclusive of them both; but between David and Zedekiah, even though we reckon in both, there were only nineteen generations. Josephus, therefore, has either spoken inaccurately in the first instance, intending *this* assertion as equivalent to the *other*; or if he is to be literally understood, he included in the number of generations Salathiel and Zerubbabel both: and this would be an important conclusion; for it would prove that he considered each of them to be lineally descended (and that through Jechonias) from David. Nor does it cause much difficulty that he talks of the supremacy as still surviving with David's posterity, in them; for Zerubbabel, being the chief of the Jews who returned from captivity, did still retain in some sense the dignity, though no longer the title of their king. But there is no proof in scripture that any descendant of Zerubbabel succeeded to his father's place; or that the revived supremacy, such as it was, did not strictly expire with him.

As the two lines of descent begin together from David, so they meet together in Salathiel; whence we may infer that Neri was contemporary with Jechonias. But if Salathiel was a lineal descendant of Jechonias, he could not be a lineal descendant of Neri. The same suppo-

^g Ant. Jud. v. ix. 4.

^h x. viii. 4.

sition then is necessary here, as in the case of Joseph and Eli; viz. that Salathiel was the son of Neri in the *civil*, and of Jechonias in the *natural* sense *. And this would be the effect produced, if he were married to a daughter of Neri; after which, the two lines, having been previously united in Zerubbabel, might again begin to diverge, through Abiud and Resa, down to Joseph and to Eli respectively. This union of the lines in the person of Zerubbabel was doubtless the effect of the special providence of God. Zerubbabel was the most illustrious of the Jews who returned from captivity; and was altogether the fittest, amongst the posterity of David, to become the founder of the line of the Messiah afresh. He was moreover himself a type of Christⁱ. Nor were the families of Solomon and Nathan so likely, perhaps, to be united at any time as during the captivity†.

* Mr. Harmer, (ii. 477. Obs. xli.) produces from the author of the Ruins of Palmyra, a genealogical record, which contains just the same difficulty, as those of our Saviour.

The person mentioned therein is called the son of Panus: yet it appears that one Æranes also was his father: so that he must have been in some sense or other the son of both.

† The Zerubbabel who is mentioned as the son of Pedai-ah, and consequently as a grandson of Jechonias^k; as it is reasonable on many accounts to presume, was a different person from Zerubbabel the son of Salathiel. I. A grandson of Jechonias, by Pedai-ah, must have been a younger person than a

grandson through Salathiel. II. Among the posterity of this Zerubbabel, neither Abiud nor Resa is mentioned, though many others are. III. The identity of the name is no objection; for bearing a distinct reference merely to the place of a person's birth, and to the circumstances of his family at the time, it might be given to others, born during the captivity in Babylon; as well as to one. IV. If there had been only one Zerubbabel, the author of the book of Ezra, who designates him there by his proper relation to Salathiel, and is believed to have compiled the book of Chronicles, would have designated him so in these last likewise.

ⁱ Hagg. ii. 23. Zech. iii. 8, 9. iv. 6—10. vi. 12, 13.

^k 1 Chron. iii. 19.

Again; if Salathiel was born B. C. 598, or B. C. 597, there is that number of years from his birth to the time of the birth of Christ; to fill up which period St. Luke's genealogy; (independent of the two names rejected;) from Salathiel to Joseph, who stands in the same relation to Eli as Mary, inclusive of both exhibits nineteen persons; and from Salathiel to the birth of Christ, nineteen generations: which is an average of thirty-one years and one half to each—no very improbable period; for the age of thirty was as common an age of marriage for males, as fourteen or fifteen was for females; of which many instances might be produced*. And as the family of Mary became gradually more and more reduced in circumstances, early marriages would become so much the less frequent in it. Within the same period, dated from the close of the captivity, B. C. 536, down to the time of Alcimus, who was appointed high priest by Antiochus Eupator, B. C. 163–162^m; Josephus reckons up fifteen high priestsⁿ, including Jeshua the son of Jozadak, who was already arrived at man's estate, when the return from captivity took place. Jozadak, the father of Jeshua, was carried into captivity along with Seraiah his father^o, eleven years after B. C. 599; that is, B. C. 588^p. Jeshua is not mentioned at this time; but the sons of Jeshua are mentioned, Ezra iii. 9; which from iii. 8 it appears comes within the second year after the return, B. C. 535. If so, Jeshua himself was born about B. C. 588; whence to B. C. 163 or B. C. 162, there are about 426 years; which allow to fourteen generations an average of thirty years and six months each.

* Μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πόλλ' ἀπολείπων,
Μήτ' ἐπιθείς μάλα πολλά· γάμος δέ τοι ὄριος οὗτος¹.

¹ Hesiod, Opera et Dies, 694.

^m Ant. Jud. xii. ix. 3. 7.

ⁿ xx. x.

^o 1 Chron. vi. 14, 15. ² Kings xxv. 18.

^p 2 Kings xxiv. 18. xxv. 2.

To fill up the same period in the genealogy of St. Matthew, from Salathiel to Joseph inclusive of both there are but twelve names in all; and from the time of the birth of Salathiel, B.C. 598, to the time of the birth of Joseph; which, if he was fifty years old at the time of the birth of Christ, would be about B.C. 54; there are only eleven generations; the average of which, in the intervening period of 544 years, would be as much as fifty years each. It is not improbable, therefore, that some names have fallen out here; and it is a singular circumstance that, if the four names which appear to have crept, over and above their proper number, into the corresponding portions of St. Luke's account, had belonged originally to St. Matthew's; the number of generations from Salathiel to Joseph would be fifteen, at an average of about thirty-six years each: which would square sufficiently well with the average in St. Luke.

There are not wanting however instances in which a few generations are seen to have taken up a great number of years. We might illustrate this circumstance from the Old Testament, compared with Josephus, in several places; but I shall be satisfied to illustrate it from the account, which the latter has left us, of his own pedigree.

Matthias, surnamed *ὁ Κυρτὸς*, between whom and Josephus there were just three generations—Josephus, Matthias, Josephus^q—was born in the first year of John Hyrcanus; that is, U.C. 619, B.C. 135^r. From this time to the year of the birth of Josephus, which was the first of Caius, U.C. 790, there were 171 years; which, divided by three, gives an average of fifty-seven years to each generation. But this interval must be still further enlarged. Between the birth of Josephus, U.C. 790, and the birth of his father Matthias, in the

^q Vita, i.^r Vide the Appendix.

tenth of Archelaus, U. C. 760, there were but thirty years. Between the birth of this Matthias, U. C. 760, and the birth of *his* father, Josephus, in the ninth of queen Alexandra, U. C. 687, there were seventy-three: and between the birth of this Josephus, in U. C. 687, and the birth of his father, Matthias ὁ Κυρτὸς, U. C. 619, there were sixty-eight. The fact is that men may have children at fifty, sixty, or seventy, as well as at twenty, thirty, or forty; and a given line of descent will be carried on in the one case, as well as in the other. Generations, of about thirty years each, will then only apply, when the calculation is made on the supposition of marriages at a regular time, and of descents in the regular way; viz. from a father to his eldest son. It is not impossible, therefore, that eleven generations only might still take up a period of 550 years.

If there have been omissions, at least, in this part of St. Matthew's genealogy, I think that they must come after Azor, the fourth name from Salathiel, on the one hand, and before Matthan, the second name from Joseph, on the other; which materially diminishes the chances of any such omissions at all. Matthan stood in that position in the time of Africanus^s: and Azor, I think, was contemporary with Nehemiah; that is, he is the same person who is mentioned by him amongst the heads of the people, under the name of Azzur^t; which the Seventy render by Ἀζούρ. Nehemiah was sent to Jerusalem in the twentieth of Artaxerxes^u, B. C. 444, just ninety-two years after the return, B. C. 536; at which time Azor was manifestly arrived at man's estate. Let us suppose that Abiud, the grandfather of Azor, was born soon after the return; which, if Zerubbabel himself was then in the flower of his age, is very likely to

^s Ut supra.^t x. 17.^u i. i. ii. i.

have been the case. From his birth to the birth of Zadok, when Azor might be thirty years old, we cannot reckon less than ninety years. It would seem from Nehemiah xii. 47, as if the age, or the government of Zerubbabel had reached very near to the time of Nehemiah himself; or at least of Ezra, whose mission took place B. C. 458. If Zerubbabel was about thirty, B. C. 536, and lived to be eighty or ninety years old, he would die not many years before the arrival of Ezra in Jerusalem.

This conclusion is further supported by the following coincidence. A son of Joiada and grandson of Eliashib was contemporary with Nehemiah, and already of a marriageable age, in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes^v; that is, B. C. 432. Now Eliashib was the grandson of Jeshua^w; as this son was of Eliashib. The father of Eliashib was Joiakim; and Joiakim (one of the sons, and probably the oldest of the sons of Jeshua^x) was not only born but arrived at man's estate, B. C. 535, in the year after the return. This Joiakim succeeded to Jeshua in the priesthood; as Eliashib succeeded to Joiakim. Now in the seventh of Artaxerxes^y, Eliashib was already high priest; and consequently Joiakim was dead. From B. C. 535, to the seventh of Artaxerxes, B. C. 458, there is an interval of seventy-seven years; whence, if Joiakim was thirty at the first of those extremes, he would be one hundred and seven at the latter. It is probable, then, that he was dead before the first, and much more before the seventh of Artaxerxes.

His age therefore at the return would be on a par with that of Zerubbabel; and Eliashib, the son of this Joiakim, would correspond, in the line of descent,

^v Neh. xiii. 28. 6.
x. 6.

^w Ib. xii. 10, 11.

^x Ezra iii. 9. x. 18.

^y Ezra

to Abiud the son of Zerubbabel. It is manifest, therefore, that a grandson of Eliashib would answer to a grandson of Abiud; the latter of whom was Azor, and the former was some son of Joiada, whose name is not mentioned; and that both were contemporary with Nehemiah. Moreover, as Azor was now arrived at man's estate, so was this grandson of Eliashib; for the former was one of the heads of the people, and the latter was married to a daughter of Sanballat the Hironite.

There is no proof, however, in any part of the book of Nehemiah, which is to be considered as his own production; that he was contemporary with any of the descendants of Jeshua later than this grandson of Eliashib, or beyond the third generation after the return from captivity: which being the case, it is abundantly sufficient to convince us that the Artaxerxes, within whose reign his mission fell, was Artaxerxes Longimanus, the first of that name; and not Artaxerxes Mnemon, the second who bore it. The reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus began B. C. 464; that of Artaxerxes Mnemon B. C. 405: and the twentieth year of the former began B. C. 445; the twentieth year of the latter, B. C. 386, and his thirty-second, B. C. 374. Now Eliashib, born as we supposed directly after the return from captivity, was alive not only in the seventh, but so late as the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes^z. This might be the case, B. C. 433, in the thirty-second of Artaxerxes Longimanus; but it is absolutely incredible of B. C. 374, the thirty-second of Artaxerxes Mnemon; as much as sixty years later. Though Eliashib had been born as early as B. C. 535, he would still be only one hundred and two years old, B. C. 433; but B. C. 375, he would be one hundred

^z Ezra x. 6. Nehem. iii. 1. xiii. 4—7. 28.

and sixty: the first of which suppositions is possible; but the latter, if not impossible, is highly incredible.

Moreover, besides Joiada^a, who afterwards succeeded him in the priesthood, he had a son called Johanan, who also was arrived at man's estate; and both before the seventh of Artaxerxes. This is very possible of the seventh of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B. C. 458, seventy-seven years after B. C. 535; and just what we might have expected: for Johanan, though younger than Joiada, might yet be more than thirty when his father was seventy-seven. But there is no mention in Ezra of any but the sons of Eliashib: as neither is there in Nehemiah of any but his grandsons. Had all these parties, however, lived in the time of Artaxerxes Mnemon, it is to be presumed that allusions would have occurred to the sons of his grandchildren. Between the seventh and the thirty-second of Artaxerxes Mnemon, that is, between B. C. 399 and B. C. 374, Jaddua, the great-grandson of Eliashib and grandson of Joiada, who was high priest and an old man B. C. 332, in the year when Alexander besieged Tyre^b, must have been not only born, but of mature age; and yet neither in Ezra nor in Nehemiah is there any mention of him.

I will conclude this subject with one more remark. It is clear from Nehemiah v. 1—6, which belongs to the twentieth of Artaxerxes; that Nehemiah came into Judæa during a period of great dearth and scarcity; which appears to have lasted as long even as the thirty-second of the same reign^c. Now it is attested by Strabo, on the authority of Xanthus the Lydian^d, that there was in the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus a very great drought; so that rivers, lakes, and wells alike were

^a Neh. xii. 10, 11. Ezra x. 6.
v. 14.

^b Ant. Jud. xi. viii. 4—7.

^c Neh.

^d i. 3. p. 132. xii. 7. §. 19. 243.

dried up. The period, during which Xanthus was writing history, is necessarily to be restricted between the first and the twentieth of Artaxerxes*^e; so that any drought of which *he* could make mention must have come within these dates. Now if some such thing took place, it is needless to argue that Judæa would be affected by it, as well as any other part of the Per-

* Dionysius Halicarn. Ant. Rom. i. 28. 73. l. 2: quotes Xanthus at some length, and gives him an high character for his research and accuracy. De Thucydide, v. 818. l. 11, he places his age a little before the Peloponnesian war, and makes him flourish μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου ἡλικίας. Diogenes Laertius, Empedocles, lib. viii. 63, quotes him as having written in praise of Empedocles, whose acme (74) he places Olympiad 84. B. C. 444. This brings down Xanthus to the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

Suidas, under the article Αἴσωπος, mentions that according to some authorities, Æsop was the slave of Xanthus the Lydian: which, however, is quite inconsistent with what is also stated of the time when Æsop lived and died, viz. from before Olymp. xl. to Olymp. liv. in the reign more particularly of Cræsus. It is contradictory likewise to Herodotus, who makes Æsop the slave of a Samian, by name Iadmon: as indeed Suidas also tells of him, according to another account, in this very place. Under the head Ξάνθος, Suidas speaks of him as γεγονώς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως Ξέρδεων: a statement which cannot be reconciled to

the other testimonies to the age of Xanthus, except by understanding the capture of Sardis in question, not of that by Cyrus, in the time of Cræsus, B. C. 546, but of that by the Ionians and Athenians, in the reign of Darius Hystaspis, B. C. 499. See Herodotus, v. 99, 100. In the phraseology of Suidas γεγονώς frequently means *natus*, and is not synonymous with ἀκμάσας; as is proved more particularly by his account of Pindar: γεγονώς κατὰ τὴν ξε΄ Ὀλυμπιάδα, κατὰ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατείαν ὧν ἑτῶν μ'. Olymp. 65. 1. answers to B. C. 520, whence to B. C. 480 is exactly 40 years. If Xanthus was born B. C. 499, he might well be writing history in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B. C. 463-444.

It is not inconsistent with the above suppositions, that (Xenophanes, lib. ix. 20.) Xenophanes, whose acme is placed Olymp. 60. B. C. 540, is called a contemporary of Empedocles. Xenophanes (ix. 19) lived to be ninety-two years old, and upwards: so that in the latter part of his life he might be actually contemporary with Empedocles, in the first part of his.

^e Vide Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, B. C. 463.

sian empire; still less that if it was so, it would necessarily be subject to a scarcity. The effect of this scarcity seems to have been that, by the twentieth of Artaxerxes, the people had mortgaged their lands and houses, and even their own persons, either to pay the king's tribute, or to maintain themselves and their families; and were very much in debt and distressed. This must have been going on some time to arrive at such an height; and as there is no allusion to it in Ezra, we may infer that it began between the seventh and the twentieth of Artaxerxes; and perhaps as near to the latter as to the former: for from the measures adopted by Nehemiah, in consequence of the complaints of the people, we may infer that a year of release for property or bondsmen, which was properly every seven years, was either lately past or just at hand. And this, as I shall prove elsewhere, was the case about the twentieth of Artaxerxes.

DISSERTATION XVII.

*Upon the question, who are meant in the Gospels by the
'Ἀδελφοὶ of Christ.*

THAT Joseph, before his marriage with the Virgin, had either been married, or had any children, is nowhere affirmed in the Gospels: nor is it by implication to be collected from any intimations which they supply. Upon this point, therefore, it would become us to suspend our judgment, rather than to undertake to decide either way; though perhaps the negative, on every account, is more probable than the affirmative. But that, after his marriage, he continued still childless, or in other words, that the Virgin Mary; as the Romish and as the modern Greek church maintain; after her union with Joseph and the birth of Christ, remained a virgin as much as before; is a tradition which, both as superstitious and as untenable, may justly be called into question. It is superstitious, because it can serve no good purpose: and it is untenable, because it is repugnant to the scriptural narrative, and to the plain inference deducible from its testimony.

It was doubtless essential to the fulfilment of prophecy that the Messiah should be born of a pure and an immaculate virgin: it was doubtless indispensable to the end of the Incarnation itself: but when those purposes had once been answered, it was clearly indifferent whether his mother remained still in her former condition, or not. The estate of matrimony, which God's word had sanctioned from the first, and every where pronounces to be becoming in all, was as open to her as to any one else; and what crime she could commit by entering into it, even after the nativity of Christ, it would be

difficult to say. It is probable that her orphan condition, and it is more than probable that the reduced circumstances of her family, rendered this not merely a lawful, but even a prudential expedient. She was contracted to Joseph before the conception of Christ; she was united to him at the time of his birth; and she continued to live with him, under the name and in the relation of his wife, long afterwards. Even *after* the conception and *before* the nativity, Joseph was admonished by God to complete the espousals, between himself and Mary, in the usual manner, as if nothing had occurred to prevent it. It was plainly intended by Providence, then, that they should live together even after the birth of Christ, in the marriage state; and if they lived together, it was equally possible that, even after the birth of Christ, they might have children. To suppose that they would be commanded to complete their union, and yet not be intended to live in the relation of husband and wife, would be to suppose an effect without a cause; a special interposition of Providence, without a special reason to produce it. It was rather to be expected that, after the conception of Christ, Mary would remain as she had continued before it, in her unmarried and single estate. The denomination of Mary *the Virgin*, except at the time when she was really so, before not merely her marriage with Joseph, but also the conception of Christ, is no where in Scripture ascribed to her. It is predicted that all generations should call her *blessed*, and the event has fulfilled that prediction; it is not predicted that she could be called *the Virgin*; and this addition to the name of *the blessed* is one of the inventions of men. But it would not be said, as in Matt. i. 25, even after Joseph had taken her home, that he abstained from the knowledge of his wife, *until* she

had been delivered of Christ, if he had abstained from the same knowledge afterwards: nor would our Lord be called, as at Matt. i. 25, and Luke ii. 7, the *first-born* of Mary, if it were not as certain that she had other children after him, as that she had none before him. I admit that the name of a *firstborn* may possibly be given even to an *only* child. But if an only child must be the first, he must also be the last: and had that been the nature of the relation here intended, both the reason of the thing and the matter of fact would have required the evangelist to say, ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν μονογενῆ, not τὸν πρωτότοκον: and to have omitted the other part of the assertion; καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκειν αὐτήν; altogether*.

* Basil, Operum i. 590. B. Homilia xxv. De Humana Christi Generatione, reasoning on Matt. i. 17, observes: τοῦτο δὲ ἡδὴ ὑπόνοιαν παρέχει, (supple,) ὥς ὅτι μετὰ τὸ καθαρῶς ὑπηρετήσασθαι τῇ γεννήσει τοῦ Κυρίου, τῇ ἐπιτελεσθείᾳ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, τὰ νενομισμένα τοῦ γάμου ἔργα μὴ ἀπαρνησαμένης τῆς Μαρίας. ἡμεῖς δὲ, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν τῷ τῆς εὐσεβείας παραλυσμαίνεται λόγῳ· μέχρι γὰρ τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὑπηρεσίας ἀναγκαῖα ἢ παρθενία· τὸ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἀπολυπραγμόνητον τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ μυστηρίου (καταλείψωμεν)· ὁμῶς διὰ τὸ μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τῶν φιλοχρίστων τὴν ἀκοὴν ὅτι ποτὲ ἐπαύσατο εἶναι παρθένος ἢ θεοτόκος, ἐκείνας ἡγοῦμεθα τὰς μαρτυρίας αὐτάρκει, κ', τ. λ.

The disposition to exalt the personal dignity of the Virgin beyond all bounds, appears strongly in Epiphanius' two treatises, Adversus Antidico-Marianitas, and Collyridianos. See the tradition recorded, i. 1062. C. D. v. respecting her conception. Ibid.

1043. C. D. he doubts even whether she died: though the tradition of her assumption does not appear to have been known to him. He is almost disposed to refer Rev. xii. 13. to her; an interpretation which it appears from Arethas, in Revel. xii. 1, apud Œcumenium, ii. 751. A. subsequent or prior commentators had not or did not scruple to adopt. Cf. in Rev. xii. 1—14. Ibid. 754. A: 756. D: 757. D. Dionysius the Areopagite bears testimony to the fact of her death; at least where he speaks of being present about her body, and hearing the hymns and praises pronounced over it by his own preceptor Hierotheus. The tradition of her assumption, then, was not yet invented in the time of the author of the works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. See Maximī Prologus, page xxxvii. and Dionysius, De Divinis Nominibus, cap. iii. §. 2. Operum i. 538, 539.

Clemens Alex. Operum ii. 889.

John ii. 12, Matt. xii. 46, Mark iii. 31, Luke viii. 19, John vii. 3. 5. 10, Acts i. 14, mention occurs of the

line 35. Strom. vii. 16: the doctrine of the immaculate virginity begins plainly to appear: ἀλλ', ὡς ἔοικεν, τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ μέχρι νῦν δοκεῖ ἡ Μαριάμ λεχῶ εἶναι, διὰ τὴν τοῦ παιδίου γέννησιν, οὐκ οὔσα λεχῶ· καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσάν φασί τινες παρθένον εὑρεθῆναι^a . . . τέτοκεν καὶ οὐ τέτοκεν, φησὶν ἡ γραφή· ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτῆς, οὐκ ἐκ συνδνασμοῦ συλλαβοῦσα.

I know not whether Tertulian had his eye upon this passage in the following, Operum iii. 393, 394. De Carne Christi, 23: Agnoscimus ergo signum contradicibile, conceptum et par-tum virginis Mariæ: de quo Academici isti: peperit et non peperit: virgo et non virgo: quasi non, et si ista dicendum esset, a nobis magis dici conveniret. peperit enim, quæ ex sua carne, et non peperit, quæ non ex virili semine. et virgo quantum a viro, non virgo quantum a partu. But this passage asserts neither the immaculate conception, nor the perpetual virginity. And Helvidius, one of those who denied the latter, for which he drew upon himself the indignation of Jerome, still (Hieronimus, Contra Helv. Operum iv. pars iida. 141. *ad med.*) referred to Victorinus Petabionensis, and to Tertullian, among the ancient authorities, by which he supported his opin-

ion. Perhaps he might refer to this passage in the latter, iii. 359. De Carne Christi, 7: Primo quidem nunquam quisquam adnunciasset illi matrem et fratres ejus foris stare, qui non certus esset habere illum matrem et fratres, et ipsos esse quos tunc nunciabat, vel retro cognitos, vel tunc ibidem compertos.

Nor will any one, I should think, venture to maintain that the notion of the perpetual virginity was transmitted from the earliest times: or that there was not always a difference of opinion in the Church about it. Even those who condemn the contrary persuasion, yet recognise the existence of it. Origen, iv. 6. D: in Joh. tom. i. 6. εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς υἱὸς Μαρίας κατὰ τοὺς ὑγιῶς περὶ αὐτῆς δοξάζοντας, ἢ Ἰησοῦς, κ', τ. λ. Hilarius Pictaviensis, Operum 467. E. Comm. in Matt. Canon. i: Venum homines pravissimi hinc præsumunt opinionis suæ autoritatem: (which opinion was that Joseph and Mary lived together as man and wife:) quod plures Dominum nostrum fratres habuisse sit traditum. In a word, Eunomius, and his followers, according to Philostorgius, vi. 2. 500, 501, the Dimæritæ, or followers of Apollinarius of Laodicea, (Epiphanius, Operum i. 1030, xxvi.) the sect, which, on account of their opinions on this

^a In this allusion, Clemens seems to refer to some tradition merely. Vide however the Codex Apocryphus, 107—113. Protevangelium Jacobi, xix. xx. which shews that it might be taken from an apocryphal Gospel. Cf. the same Protevangelium in the Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi, 227—232. xix. xx. Cf. also the Hypomnesticon of Josephus, v. cxxxvi. 288—293. Also the narrative, which is found in Suidas, sub vocibus, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς ἡμῶν: p. 1750. C—F.

brethren—οἱ ἀδελφοί—of our Lord ; and Matt. xiii. 55. 56. Mark vi. 3, of his *brethren* and of his *sisters* both ; and this, at times and on occasions which, as it will be seen hereafter, synchronized with the beginning, with the middle, and with the very end of his ministry. The parties alluded to, in all these instances, were obviously persons, whether male or female, arrived at maturity ; as though born of the same parents, and yet younger than our Saviour, they might still be, thirty or thirty-two years after the birth of Christ. What kind of relationship is thus implied, except the natural one in the ordinary sense of the terms, it is not easy to say. The use of the term brethren ἀπλῶς leads directly to that one conclusion. They could not be the children of any other Mary, distinct from the mother of our Lord—at least exclusively—because it is always Mary the mother

subject, Epiphanius calls by the singular name of Antidico-Marianitæ, (1033. seqq.,) the Jews, according to Suidas, voce ἔως, (Cf. the Epistles of Isidore of Pelusium, i. 18, whence this quotation is taken,) the Pauliciani mentioned by Theodore Metochita, (Hist. Rom. 12 : Cf. Zonaræ Annales, xviii. 26. 305. A :) besides the persons specified above, differed from the more popular belief, with respect to the perpetual virginity ; and either in consequence of some well authenticated tradition to that effect, or because the Gospel narrative itself seemed to lead to no other conclusion, maintained that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of Christ.

The δεσπόσυνοι, or persons related to the Lord κατὰ σάρκα, are often alluded to by Africanus, in his well-known letter to

Aristides, Eusebius, E. H. i. vii. 22. C. and in his Chronicon. Descendants of Judas, one of the Lord's reputed brethren, were living in the reign of Domitian ; and from the language of Hegesippus, who speaks of them, must have been two in number : E. H. iii. 20. 89. C. The lineal descendants of Mary, the mother of Jesus, are more likely to be meant by this description than any others ; nor is it easy to conceive why a particular family should come to be known and distinguished by such a title and such a relationship to our Lord, if they were merely a collateral branch, the children of a sister of Mary, or of a brother of Joseph : in which sense any, who like them derived their pedigree from David, might be called the relations of the Lord.

of our Lord, and not any other Mary who is mentioned along with them; who was obviously living with them, and making one of some family with them: which it is not probable that she would make with any family but her own.

It may be said, however, that these might be the children of Joseph, but by some former, or at least some different wife; in which case, they might still be called the ἀδελφοὶ, or ἀδελφαὶ, of our Lord; and Mary might possibly be living with them. But the fact of this double marriage of Joseph, as I have observed, is purely a gratuitous assumption, without countenance from any authentic historical testimony, or even any traditionary, which does not contradict itself*. Nor, except upon one supposition, which would obviously beg the question, viz. that Joseph never could have had children, either sons or daughters, by Mary, the mo-

* Origen, *Operum* iii. 462. E. *Comm. in Matt.* tom. x. 17 : *ᾠοντο οὖν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἰωσήφ καὶ Μαρίας υἱόν· τοὺς δὲ ἀδελφούς· Ἰησοῦ φασὶ τινες εἶναι, ἐκ παραδόσεως ὀρμώμενοι τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίου, ἣ τῆς βίβλου Ἰακώβου, υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ ἐκ προτέρας γυναικὸς, συνακηκίας αὐτῷ πρὸ τῆς Μαρίας. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα λέγοντες τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς Μαρίας ἐν παρθενίᾳ τηρεῖν μέχρι τέλους βούλονται, κ', τ. λ.*

Hieronymus, *Operum* iv. 52. *ad calc. in Matt.* xiii: *Quidam fratres Domini de alia uxore Joseph filios suspicantur, sequentes deliramenta apocryphorum, et quamdam Melcham vel Escham mulierculam confingentes.*

Yet another statement (*Theophylact*, i. 71. E. in *Matt.* xiii: Cf. 161. D. E. in *Matt.* xxvii: 260. C. D. in *Marc.* xv: 491. B. C. in *Luc.* xxiv: 753. E. in *Joh.* xix.)

supposes this former wife of Joseph to be the wife of his brother Cleopas, whom he married by the law of Levirate, his brother having died childless.

These contradictory accounts shew that they are all purely conjectural; and they sufficiently confute each other.

Theodorit, *Operum* iii. 366. in *Ep. ad Gal.* i. 19: *James, ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἐκαλεῖτο μὲν, οὐκ ἦν δὲ φύσει. οὔτε μὴν, ὥς τινες ὑπελήφασιν, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς ἐτύγχανεν ὢν, ἐκ προτέρων γάμων γενόμενος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ μὲν ἦν υἱὸς, τοῦ δὲ Κυρίου ἀνεψιός· μητέρα γὰρ εἶχε τὴν ἀδελφὴν τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου μητέρας.*

This may be true in every respect, except that of James his being the son of Cleopas: for St. Luke distinctly makes him the son of Alphæus, whom he also distinguishes from Cleopas.

ther of Jesus, his actual wife, is it more gratuitous than unnecessary. If any such other wife of Joseph once existed, still before the commencement of our Saviour's ministry, that is, before John ii. 12, at least, she must have been dead; and if she was dead before that point of time, she might have been dead some length of time before it. It seems equally clear that Joseph himself was not then alive, any more than she. It would follow, therefore, that these sons and daughters, the fruit of a distinct marriage, were all older, instead of being all younger than our Saviour; and if the difference of years, between the age of Joseph and that of the Virgin, was such as has been supposed, were much older too: a conclusion which would involve us in great perplexity. Nor do I see how it could come to pass that our Lord should be so commonly reputed the son of Joseph and Mary; that is, should be confounded with their natural offspring; if he had not brothers or sisters, who were naturally their offspring, and justly to be considered such.

Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3, the names of these ἀδελφοὶ of our Lord are specified as follows: James and Joses*, Simon and Jude, or Jude and Simon. Now John vii. 5, at a point of time which coincides with the third feast of Tabernacles; his ἀδελφοὶ, it is said, did not believe in him; and Matt. xii. 46, Mark iii. 21, iii. 31, Luke viii. 19—all relating to a point of time one year earlier than the notice in St. John—implicitly confirm St. John. Yet, Acts i. 14, they must have become believers *after*

* The name of Joseph often occurs, instead of Joses, as the other of the sons of Mary. See Origen, iii. 462. in Matt. tom. x. 17: 929. F. 930. F. Comm. in Matt. Secundum Veterem Interpretationem, 141—144: Eusebius ad Marinum, Quæstio ii.

SS. Deperditorum Vaticana Coll. i. 69. C: Codex Apocryphus, 104. Protevangelium Jacobi xvii: Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi, 224. Protevangelium Jacobi xvii: Eusebius, i. 497. C. in 1 ad Cor. ix. 5.

the resurrection, and *before* the descent of the Holy Ghost; and 1 Cor. ix. 5, they must have become, in due time, evangelists of Christianity itself. If then they continued unbelievers up to the time of the last Passover, and yet were converted before the day of Pentecost ensuing; it is probable they were converted by the fact of the resurrection between those dates. It would be, consequently, during their unbelieving state that our Saviour, John xix. 25—27, committed his mother in his dying moments, to the care not of these his brethren, but of St. John. And this as I think is the best reason why he might pass over them, even though they had been present;—and commit his mother to St. John. Not but that commentators, both ancient and modern, have supposed some relationship between the Virgin and St. John; which, if the fact of this relationship could be made out, might conspire to account for the same effect*.

* The relationship in question is that of a nephew of the Virgin; Salome the mother of St. John, and Mary the mother of our Lord, being supposed to have been sisters.

In a fragment, ascribed to Papias, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, i. 16, four Mariæ are specified by name; Mary, (*Mater Domini*,) Mary, (*Cleophæ sive Alphei uxor*,)—mother of James, (*episcopi et apostoli*,) and of Symeon and Thadeus, (fortasse Judas,) and of a certain Joseph, (that is, Joses,)—Mary Salome, wife of Zebedee, and Mary Magdalene.

The remainder of this fragment agrees so closely with what occurs Hieronymus, *Contra Helvidium*, *Operum* iv. pars ii^a. 138. *ad med.*, also 52. 53. pars i^a. in Matt. xiii, as to lead to the inference either that Jerome copied it into his work *Contra*

Helvidium from Papias; or, as I should rather believe, that it is improperly ascribed to the latter, and really belongs to Jerome. As it stands in the *Reliquiæ*, it is as follows:

Jacobus et Judas et Joseph (*Joses*) filii erant materteræ Domini. Jacobus quoque et Joannes (the sons of Zebedee) alterius materteræ Domini fuerunt filii.

Maria, Jacobi minoris et Joseph (*Josis*) mater, uxor Alphei, soror fuit Mariæ, matris Domini; quam Cleophæ Joannes nominat, vel a patre, vel a gentilitatis familia, vel alia de causa. Maria Salome vel a viro vel a vico dicitur: hanc eandem Cleophæ quidam dicunt, quod duos viros habuerit.

This account supposes that Mary Salome was the sister of the Virgin, and aunt of our Lord. It supposes also that after

Be this however as it may; still with respect to the unbelief of our Lord's ἀδελφοὶ, the gospel accounts are not inconsistent with each other. They all shew, either directly or by implication, that up to the close of his public ministry his brethren, or some at least who are called by that name, were not believers as yet: but none of them implies that they did not become so afterwards.

Now amongst those who, even in the lifetime of Christ, were not merely believers, but already disciples and already apostles of our Lord; Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, Luke vi. 15, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου is invariably mentioned as one: and if this James was James the first bishop of Jerusalem, then, Gal. i. 19, and even Josephus, Ant. xx. ix. 1—this James was undoubtedly known by the denomination of the ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, or τοῦ Χριστοῦ. There was one, then, even in the lifetime of Christ, known as an ἀδελφὸς or brother of Christ, who believed in him: and there were others, known by the same relation, who did not believe in him. It follows, therefore, either that this one of his brethren was a particular exception to the rest; or that there were a number of persons, all of whom might be called in some sense or other, ἀδελφοὶ or brethren of Christ, and yet be distinct from each other: some of whom believed in him, and others believed not.

the death of Zebedee, she was again married to another husband, called Cleophas. There is great inconsistency in these several statements; which may partly be owing to the circumstance that the whole account is a cento from different authors—and not all, as it professes to be, the production of Papias.

For Epiphanius' account of the parentage of Joseph; his double marriage; the number

and names of his children; see i. 1039. B. Antidico-Marianitæ, vii. viii: 432. D. Alogi, x: 1045. B. Antidico-Marianitæ, xiii: 1046. D. Ibid. xiv: Operum ii. 62. D. Ancoratus, lx. Cf. likewise, Theophylact, Operum i. 504. C. in Joh. Præfatio. In each of these latter instances Salome is supposed to be a daughter of Joseph, and so far a sister of our Lord.

Now according to the Hebrew idiom, the relation of son is extended to every direct remove, however distant, from the fountain head; and on the same principle, the relation of brother or sister to every collateral, equally remote*. In proof of this idiom, the very subject under discussion supplies a case in point. Matt. xxvii. 56, Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1, Luke xxiv. 10; the Mary, there spoken of, is described as Mary the mother of James: concerning which James, we may take it for granted, that he is James the Apostle, the son of Alphæus. But in the parallel place of John xix. 25, she is described as the ἀδελφὴ or sister of Mary the mother of Jesus; from both which designations we may argue as follows.

If this Mary was really the *sister* of the Virgin,

* Gen. xx. 12: And yet indeed *she is* my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother: which is spoken by Abraham of Sarah, who is commonly supposed to have been the daughter of Haran, and the sister of Lot; and would, therefore, be Abraham's niece. In like manner, xxiv. 48: Rebekah is called Abraham's brother's daughter: and yet she was but *his* granddaughter; that is, Abraham's nephew's daughter: and, xxvi. 7, by Isaac she is called his sister, doubtless because she was his *cousin*. See also xxix. 12. 15.

But the most remarkable example of this mode of speaking is supplied by 2 Chron. xxii. 8; compared with 2 Kings x. 13, where the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah are called his brethren. Now these could not be Ahaziah's *father's* children, for

(2 Chron. xxi. 17, xxii. 1) they had been killed by the Arabians: nor yet *their* children's children: for they were now grown up, but Ahaziah himself, at this time, was but twenty-two, and his oldest brother could not have been more than one or two years older; and consequently could have had no son arrived at man's estate.

The truth is, these sons of the brethren of Ahaziah were his cousins; Jehoshaphat's grandsons, the sons of his father's brethren, who are mentioned 2 Chron. xxi. 2, as six in number. These six might have forty-two children among them; who might be grown up to maturity, and be on a par in point of age with Ahaziah himself, when Jehu put them all to death. Jehoram, it is true, put their fathers to death, 2 Chron. xxi. 4: but it is not said that he made away with their children also.

their children would be simply *cousins*; and consequently James, the son of this Mary, could not be really the *brother* of Jesus, the son of the other Mary: and therefore ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, as applied to him, cannot mean the *brother* of the Lord. But if she was not really the *sister* of Mary, then ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, as applied to her, does not mean the *sister* of his mother. In either case it will follow that ἀδελφὸς, or ἀδελφὴ, may strictly denote not the relation of a brother or a sister; but at the utmost of a male or a female cousin. The term therefore in a given instance, agreeably to the Jewish usage, may imply no more than this. Nor is it possible even partially to escape this conclusion, except by contending that this Mary was really the *sister* of the Virgin, and really the *wife* of Joseph: in which case two uterine sisters must have both borne the name of Mary; must have both been married to Joseph, and both been living in marriage with him at the same time; which, I think, is directly repugnant to Lev. xviii. 18: and Joseph himself must have borne the other name of Alphæus. All these suppositions are very incredible, and open to the greatest objections. Besides which, Mary is called in the same passage, John xix. 25, ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ; which must be understood with the ellipsis of γυνή, agreeably to the Latin idiom—Apicatam Sejani^a; Agrippina Germanici^b;—Antonia Drusi^c;—Verania Pisonis^d; Livia Rutilii; Terentia Ciceronis; Clodia Aufilii^e—in all which there is the same ellipsis of uxor*. Now Cleopas, if Hegesippus^g is to be believed, was him-

* So common is this ellipsis, both in Latin and in Greek, that Eckhel^f considers it a great singularity to find the word γυνή

expressed on some of the coins of Agrippina, the consort of Claudius.

^a Tacitus, Ann. iv. 11. ^b Pliny, H. N. vii. 11. ^c Ib. vii. 18. ^d Pliny Epistolæ, ii. xx. ^e Val. Max. viii. xiii. 6. So Ignatius ad Polycarpum, viii. PP. Apostolici, 878. E. τὴν τοῦ Ἐπιτρόπου (scil. γυναῖκα.) ^f vi. 259. ^g Eusebius, E. H. iii. 11.

self the brother of Joseph. But, Lev. xviii. 16, except in the case provided by the Law, to marry with the wife of a brother, even after his death^h, was forbidden. Πάλιν δύο ἀδελφὰς ἄγεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει, οὔτ' ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, οὔτ' ἐν διαφέρουσι χρόνοις, καὶν τύχῃ τις ἢν προέγμην ἀπεωσμένοςⁱ.

We are at liberty, then, to assume that the name of ἀδελφὸς amongst the Jews, may be applied indifferently to the relation of brother, or to the relation of cousin. Hence, it may be so applied, Matt. xiii. 55, and Mark vi. 3; that is, some of the persons, there mentioned by name, may be strictly the brethren, and the rest may be merely the cousins of our Lord. But how are we to discriminate them asunder? I observe that the two first are called James and Joses; the two last Simon and Jude, or Jude and Simon. I observe also, and it appears to me a critical coincidence, that Mary, the ἀδελφὴ or cousin of the Virgin, who is called, Mark xvi. 1, and Luke xxiv. 10, Mary the mother of *James*, is called, Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40. 47, Mary the mother of *James* and *Joses*. It is an obvious and natural inference that this James and this Joses, who are here described as the children of Mary, are the same James and the same Joses, who were described above, Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3, as amongst the ἀδελφοὶ of our Lord. I observe too, that Mary is never called the mother of Simon and Jude, or of Jude and Simon; and therefore I cannot assume that these were her children also. One of our Saviour's Apostles, besides Judas Iscariot, was certainly called Jude^j; the same who, Matt. x. 3, Mark iii. 18, is also called Leb-bæus or Thaddæus; and whom Luke vi. 16, Acts i. 13, each describe by a certain relation to James;

^h Jos. Ant. Jud. xvii. xiii. 1. ⁱ Philo, ii. 303. l. 44. De Specialibus Legibus.
^j John xiv. 22. Luke vi. 16. Acts i. 13.

which his own Epistle, Jude 1, proves to be rightly pronounced the relation of brother. This Jude, then, as well as James, must have been a son of Alphæus; but this Jude is never called, like James, a son of Mary, nor consequently a brother in any sense of our Lord. I infer then that he was no such son of Mary, though he might be the son of Alphæus; and I assign thereby a reason which no commentator, as far as I know, has yet been able satisfactorily to do, why he should call himself the *brother* of James, but not the brother of Christ. Alphæus, whosoever he was, was married to two wives; one, the mother of Jude the Apostle, the other, Mary, the cousin of the Virgin, and mother of James and Joses; that is, consequently, of the ἀδελφοὶ or cousins of Christ.

That Alphæus was no uncommon name among the Jews, may be collected from Mark ii. 14, where Levi is called the son of Alphæus; unless, what is not probable, this Levi also (in other words, unless St. Matthew the Apostle) was the brother of James and Jude. Hence, if Alphæus is not another name for Cleopas, (which also Luke vi. 15, compared with xxiv. 18, shews not to be probable;) at the time of our Lord's crucifixion, when, John xix. 25, this Mary is called the wife of Cleopas, Alphæus was dead; and Mary also had been twice married, once to Alphæus and again to Cleopas. Nor is it unlikely that the marriage at Cana in Galilee, John ii. 1, only three years before xix. 25, was this very marriage of Cleopas and Mary; especially if Mary was the sister or cousin of the Virgin, and Cleopas the brother or cousin of Joseph: for both our Lord and his mother were present at it, which proves that it was the marriage of relations; and St. John, who alone mentions this marriage, mentions also alone the consequent relation of Mary to Cleopas.

If now Mary, the mother of James and Joses, was married to Alphæus about the same time when Mary the Virgin was espoused to Joseph ; the Apostle James might be about the same age with our Saviour : as we may presume that all or most of his Apostles were, at the time when he entered on his ministry. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the Apostle Jude was much older or much younger than James. It will follow however that this Jude, the brother of James, the Disciple and Apostle of our Lord, as well as he, is a different person from Jude, who is mentioned along with Simon, as one of the other two ἀδελφοὶ or brethren of Christ. He could not be one of that number, and not a son of Mary the cousin of the Virgin, and yet a believer in and an Apostle of Christ. For the same reason neither can the other, Simon, be the same with that Simon, also an Apostle, who is denominated in every catalogue of the Apostles, as Simon the Cananite or Simon the Zealot : and both these conclusions, I think, may be further confirmed as follows.

I. 1 Cor. ix. 5. the ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου are spoken of there, either amongst or distinct from the λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι ; yet as evangelists of Christianity, and as married men. Now none of the Apostles, except James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, is ever spoken of or described as a brother of the Lord : and concerning this James the following facts are almost certain^k ; first, that he was not a married man ; secondly, that if he had been, he could not have led about a wife, a sister—he was always stationary at Jerusalem ; and this, as we shall see hereafter, was eminently true of the time (U.C. 808—U.C. 809) when the First to the Corinthians was written, and St. Paul came up to Jerusalem. As St. Paul, however, in the passage above recited, leads to

^k Eusebius, E. H. ii. 23. iv. 22. 142. C.

the inference that the ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, one or more, were married men; so does Eusebius, on the authority of Hegesippus^l, confirm the inference; shewing that there were persons, πρὸς γένους κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου, still alive after the destruction of Jerusalem; and descendants of Judas in particular, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, in the reign of Domitian, and down to the time of Trajan: which descendants he specifies as his νιωνοὺς, or grandchildren. The persecution of the Christians by Domitian Eusebius places in the fifteenth year of his reign^m; and Dio Cassiusⁿ so far confirms Eusebius as to place the death of Flavius Clemens, at that time consul, on the charge ἀθεότητος, (whence he is believed to have suffered as a Christian;) in the year U.C. 848, A.D. 95, the last year but one of Domitian*. It is manifestly possible, if Jude was married before U.C. 808, A. D. 55, that he might have grandchildren arrived at man's estate, A. D. 95, forty years afterwards.

II. It is affirmed on the authority of the same Hegesippus, in the places of Eusebius above referred to, that the second bishop of Jerusalem, appointed upon the death of James, and on the return of the church after the Jewish war, was Symeon, a name which is the same with Simon†. This Symeon suffered by mar-

* Juvenal, iv. 117. Dignus Aricinos qui mendicaret ad axes: which the Scholiast understands of the Jews, who being expelled from Rome, had taken refuge at Aricia. The Satire was written after the death of Domitian.

If Philostratus (Apollonius Ty-an. viii. 10. 424. A.) is to be credited, Domitian was assassinated

only three or four days after the death of Flavius Clemens. This statement would agree more exactly with Eusebius, but it would contradict Dio and Suetonius.

† The order of the three first bishops of Jerusalem, according to the Apostolical Constitutions, vii. 46, to Eusebius, (E. H. and Chron. Arm.-Lat.) to Epipha-

^l E. H. iii. 11. Cf. Ib. 19. 20. 32. Vide also Reliquiæ Sacræ, ii. 120. 121. Africani Epistola ad Aristidem. ^m E. H. iii. 18. 89. A. Cf. Suet. Domitianus, 15. ⁿ lxvii. 14.

tyrdom in the reign of Trajan, and ἐπὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικουῦ; that is, before a consular president, Atticus; at one hundred and twenty years old*. It is true that Eusebius calls him (and so does Hegesippus, if he has been quoted rightly) the son of Cleopas. But to this tradition, I think, we are entitled to pay no attention; for Eusebius *loco cit.* speaks of Mary also as the daughter of Cleopas—understanding John xix. 25, ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, with the ellipsis not of γυνή but of θυγάτηρ. There is no proof from scripture that Cleopas had any children; much less any son who was called Simon.

The time of the martyrdom of Symeon is placed by Eusebius in Chronico, in the tenth of Trajan, U. C. 860, A. D. 107: in which case Symeon must have been born U. C. 740, B. C. 14. But if Cleopas was the brother of Joseph, he would probably be almost as old as Joseph at the time of the birth of Christ: in which

nus, (i. 636. D. Manichæi xx.) to Jerome, (Chronico.) to Syn- cellus, Nicephorus, and others, is this—James, Simon the reputed son of Cleopas, and Justus or Judas. The name and the fact of the succession of Simon, the Apostolical Constitutions and Eusebius probably took from Hegesippus: the rest, probably, took them from Eusebius: who, however, admits (E. H. iv. 5.) that the succession of the bishops of Jerusalem from Trajan to Hadrian was very uncertain; and though he gives their names and order, he does not undertake to fix their times. Between Justus, who is supposed to succeed in the tenth of Trajan, and Jude, who was bishop at the time of the war under Hadrian, inclusively of both, thirteen names are given in all; who

could not, upon an average, have sat more than two years and three months each. This is sufficient to shew how little is known about them. It is absurd to suppose that there could have been thirteen bishops in the last twenty-nine years, when there were only two in the first seventy-seven, of the period between the ascension and the close of the war under Hadrian. Eusebius, indeed, says these bishops in particular were κομιδῇ βραχύβιοι; but he assigns no reason why they were so, more than the bishops of the Gentile churches.

* Cf. also Œcumenius in Acta Apostolorum—the abstract of the lives and preaching of the Apostles prefixed to that work.

case, though he might have a son fourteen years old A.D. 1, it is not likely he would have married another wife A.D. 27, or even that he would then have been alive, any more than Joseph. It is much more probable that Symeon, the second bishop of Jerusalem, was Simon, the brother of Jude and son of Joseph and Mary; one of the two brethren of our Lord, falsely reputed the son of Cleopas. The appointment of Simon, if he also was the brother of our Lord, to be the second bishop of Jerusalem, was just as natural as the appointment of James, both on that account, and because he was an Apostle, to be the first.

And with respect to the time of his death, I do not see on what grounds Eusebius has referred it to the tenth of Trajan. The language of Hegesippus is to the effect that he suffered ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος, καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ; that is, before Trajan and Atticus in conjunction: and it is clear that he suffered in Palestine, or somewhere else upon the spot. It would follow then that he suffered at some time when Trajan was in the East: for the determination of which time, I may be content to refer implicitly to Eckhel^o, who proves that the emperor Trajan was once only in the East; and that upon his Armenian, Parthian, or other expeditions in those quarters*.

* The year of his reign, when he set out upon these expeditions, may be presumptively collected from Dio.

For first; Licinius Sura was dead before these expeditions began^p; and Licinius Sura was not dead before the tenth of Trajan, in which year he was consul. The same thing appears to be implied of Sosius and Palma also^q; the latter of whom, when last mentioned^r,

was mentioned as governor of Syria. This would make the expeditions later not only than the tenth of Trajan, when Sosius was consul, but also than the twelfth, when Palma was so.

Secondly; after the commencement of these expeditions, there was one campaign during the same year, in Armenia; another in the next year, in Parthia; a third after them both, in Arabia; which third coin-

^o vi. 451—454.

^p lxviii. 15.

^q Ib. 16.

^r Ib. 14.

If Symeon then was put to death ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ as well as ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ, he could not be put to death before the eighteenth of Trajan, at the earliest. If Atticus was governor of Syria at the time*, the tenth year of Trajan at least seems to be out of the question. For Palma, not Atticus, was certainly president of that

cided with the nineteenth of Trajan, U.C. 869^s, the last year but one of his reign. On this principle, the first year of these wars, and consequently either the year of Trajan's arrival in the East, or the year after that at the latest; must have been U.C. 867, the seventeenth of his reign.

It is in unison with this conclusion, that Trajan was wintering at Antioch, after one year's campaign and preparatory to taking the field again in the next, when the great earthquake happened there^t. The year of this earthquake is ascertained by the death of Pedo, one of the sufferers from it, and consul ἐπὶ ὀνυμος at the time, U.C. 868; the beginning of the eighteenth year of Trajan. John Malala places the earthquake December 13, Ἀεραῖ Antiochenæ 164^u; which, if deduced from the epoch of U.C. 705, would be December 13, U.C. 868—at the end, not at the beginning, of the eighteenth of the reigning emperor. At the same timē, according to this historian, Trajan had been two years in the East; which would place his arrival U.C. 816. But Malala's authority is not equal to that of

Dio; according to whom, if there was one campaign of Trajan's, U.C. 867; another, U.C. 868; a third, U.C. 869; and a fourth, U.C. 870, in the midst of which Trajan was surprised by death; and the campaign in U.C. 868 was posterior to the earthquake, when Pedo was consul and killed by it; the earthquake could not have happened before the first of January, U.C. 868, at least. And it is possible that it actually happened on the thirteenth of January, U.C. 868; not on the thirteenth of December, U.C. 867, or U.C. 868.

Eusebius, *Chronicon Armeno-Latinum*, places this earthquake in the 17th of Trajan; which would not expire until January 27, U.C. 868.

* It is true that, in Spartian's *Life of Hadrian*, (caput 4.) Hadrian is spoken of as legate of Syria, at the time of the death of Trajan: III. id. August, U.C. 870: but this was almost two years after the time when the latter was wintering at Antioch. Nor does it appear that Hadrian was then in Syria, as the regular governor; but only as commander of the forces instead of Trajan. Dio, lxxviii. 33.

^s Dio, lxxviii. 17. 18. 24. 26. 31. 32.

A little before this, page 273. 5—19, Malala gives us the letter of Tiberianus, described as governor of Palæstina Prima at the time, relating to the persecution of the Galilæans or Christians then going on. The date of this letter, in Malala, would be about this period of the reign of Trajan, when the earthquake happened. As far as it can be depended on, it confirms Hegesippus and Eusebius, by implying that a persecution of Christianity was going on in these parts more particularly, and at this time, when Symeon also might suffer. Cf. Suidas in Τραϊανός.

^t Ib. 24. 25.

^u Lib. xi. 275. l. 5.

province, U. C. 858, in the eighth of Trajan^v; and the context of Dio^w implies that he was still president in the tenth, at the close of the Dacian war; and later than that, at the time of the death of Sura, which could not well be earlier than the eleventh of Trajan. Had Symeon then suffered in the tenth of Trajan, and before a Roman president of Syria; it would have been ἐπὶ Πάλμῳ, not ἐπὶ Ἀττικῷ.

But the testimony of Hegesippus at the same time describes this Atticus as ὑπατικόν; that is, as one who was of consular dignity, and therefore had been consul. The Fasti Consulares exhibit no Atticus as consul before U. C. 896, in the sixth of Antoninus Pius: and that was Herodes Atticus, probably the son of this Atticus, and the contemporary and friend of Aulus Gellius^x. We have the assurance however of Suidas and of Philostratus, for knowing that Atticus the father was twice consul; and by virtue of his consular dignity was sometime governor of all or of part of Asia^y. The latter biographer informs us that he acquired the wealth, which laid the foundation of his future dignity, in the reign of Nerva; and that he was governor of Asia in the reign of Hadrian. His first consulate then probably fell out in the reign of Trajan; but, as it is not less probable, late in that reign, rather than early: and if we were to conjecture that he was appointed consul *suffectus* in the room of Pedo, U. C. 868, it would not be an extraordinary supposition.

In the next year, also, which would be the nineteenth of Trajan, the rebellion of the Jews in Cyrene, Cyprus, and Egypt broke out^{*z}; the connection of which

* Eusebius, Chron. Arm. Lat. rebellion to begin in the eight-
and E. H. iv. 2, supposes this eenth, to continue through the

^v Eckhel, vi. 418. ^w lxviii. 14, 15. ^x Noctes Atticæ, i. 2. ix. 2. xviii.
10. xix. 12. ^y Suidas, Ἡρώδης Ἀττικός. Philostratus, Vitæ Sophistarum, ii.
Herodes, 545. A. Cf. i. Polemo, Scopelianus, Nicetes. ^z Dio, lxviii. 32.
Eusebius, H. E. iv. 2. Appian, B. C. ii. 90.

event, as well as of the earthquake, just before, with the persecution in which Symeon suffered, is very probably implied in the account which Eusebius has left of it. For, first, the persecution was not general, but μερικῶς καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, ἐξ ἐπαναστάσεως δῆμων, the moving cause to which was commonly some national calamity, as a drought, a famine, or an earthquake; all which the populace were accustomed to lay to the charge of the ἄθροιοι, that is, of the Christians. Secondly, Symeon was denounced as one of the posterity of David; an accusation, which the rebellion of the Jews was most likely to suggest, and to render dangerous.

The contest does not appear to have lasted more than one year; and we are told by Dio, *loco citato*, and by Eusebius, *Chron. Arm.*, that Lusius, the commander of the Roman forces, was made governor of Palestine, in return for his services in the war*. The government of Palestine, then, was probably conferred upon him in the twentieth of Trajan, U. C. 870: whence, if Symeon was put to death in Palestine, and ἐπὶ Ἀττικοῦ not ἐπὶ Λουσίου, he could not have been put to death as not earlier than the eighteenth of Trajan on the one hand, so neither later than the twentieth on the other; the inference from which is that he was probably put to death in the nineteenth itself. In this case he was put to death U. C. 869, A. D. 116;

nineteenth, and even into the twentieth of Trajan. Spartian, also, Hadrianus, 5, speaks of the people of Palestine as being in a state of revolt at the time of the death of Trajan.

* That is, Lusius Quietus, as appears from a comparison with Eusebius, E. H. iv. 2. The history of this Lusius Quietus—whose name in full appears to

have been Quintus Lusius Quietus—(see Dio, lxxviii. 32.) is much confounded with that of Lusius Lupus, governor of Egypt about the same time. Vide the note, *supra*, page 80, Dissertation xv. Perhaps the latter Lusius was the person actually rewarded with the government of Palestine, while the former was appointed to Mauritania.

and, therefore, if he was a son of Joseph and Mary, born after the birth of Christ indeed, but two or three years before the vulgar era, he might be actually one hundred and nineteen years old at his death; which, in round numbers, would naturally be called one hundred and twenty.

III. St. Luke's mention of the name of Simon ^z, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτὴν, is not exactly to the same effect with that of St. Matthew, Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης, or that of St. Mark ^a, Σίμωνα τὸν Κανανίτην: that is, there would be no reason to infer from either of the latter that he was *called* Simon the Cananite, as there is to infer from the former that he was called Simon the Zealot. It is commonly believed, indeed, that Simon the Zealot is an equivalent designation to Simon the Cananite. But this does not appear to me to be the case. For in the first place, the Hebrew root זנך, *zelotypus fuit*, cannot be shewn to have given birth to any such verbal derivative, as זנך or נך, from which only Κανανίτης, as equivalent to Ζηλωτής, could be transferred into Greek. Secondly, Κανανίτης, or Cananite, would be as regularly formed from Κανὰν, or Canan, as Canaanite from Canaan, Horonite from Horon, Canite or Canaïte from Cana, Gaulanite from Gaulan, or the like: all which are nomina *gentilitia*, derived from the names of countries or places, to express the inhabitants or the natives thereof.

Thirdly; there is proof in Strabo that Canan was the name of a certain village; which might be a village of Judæa, and was certainly some village in the East. Speaking of the illustrious men whom Tarsus had produced, he mentions two philosophers of the name of Athenodorus; one of whom was a contemporary and a preceptor or tutor of Augustus Cæsar, whom

^z vi. 15.

^a Matt. x. 4. Mark iii. 18.

he calls the son τοῦ Σάνδωνος, ὃν καὶ Κανανίτην φασὶν ἀπὸ κώμης τινός *^b. This name of Sando, the father of Athenodorus, is evidently not a Greek one, like the name of his son †; and Canan, the name of his native village, is still less like the name of a Grecian settlement: not to mention that such Grecian settlements, at least in the East, are commonly known and described as πόλεις, not as κῶμαι. The fact however that, either in the neighbourhood of Tarsus, or in some of the adjacent countries, there was at this time a village, from the name of which Κανανίτης would be regularly derived, and which must consequently have been called Κανάν; is placed by this testimony beyond a question. I should conjecture that it was either in Phœnicia or in Judæa; and that Sando, though born there, had afterwards migrated to Tarsus. Simon the Cananite is a designation absolutely identical with that of Sando the Cananite; and if the latter was taken from the name of some village, the former, as it is reasonable to suppose, was taken either from the same, or from some other, which bore the same name.

Fourthly; the appellation of Cananite, as equivalent to Zealot, if it was bestowed upon Simon before his ordination as an apostle, and related to any circumstance in his history, prior to that event, would imply that he either was or had been a Zealot; which as a term

* De Athenodoro, τῷ Σάνδωνος, cf. Cicero, Epistolæ ad Fam. iii. 7: Plutarch, Poplicola, 17: Dio Chrys. Oratio xxxiii. 24. 1. 20: Ælian, Variæ Historiæ, xii. 25: Lucian, iii. 223. Macrobii 21: Clemens Alex. Cohortatio, i. 42, 43: Stephanus Byz. Ἀγχιάλη: Juliani Cæsares, 326. A.

† According to Ammianus Marc. xiv. 8, p. 39, the founder of Tarsus itself was called Sandan, ex Æthiopia profectus, vir opulentus et nobilis. Yet, Suidas, Σάνδων, Ἑλλανίκου, φιλόσοφος—κ', τ. λ. might be the father of Athenodorus.

^b xiv. 4. §. 14. 704. Cf. Dio, lvi. 43.

of distinction denoted a follower of Judas of Galilee, the founder of the sect of the Zealots. Now the followers of Judas of Galilee, and consequently the *sect* which he had founded; if we may believe the assurance of Gamaliel in the Acts^c; were suppressed as soon as they appeared; and at the time of the deliberation in the Acts, to which we are referring, were notoriously dispersed and scattered. It follows, therefore, that no disciple of our Lord, at the time of his ordination to be an apostle, whatever might have been his previous history, could still be known and described as a *Zealot*; that is, as a follower of Judas of Galilee. And if, notwithstanding what he had once been, he was actually no longer such; it would have been not merely an erroneous, but an unjust and disparaging manner of describing him, still to represent him as *the Zealot*. The name of Zealot was identified from the very first with faction and turbulence; and in the course of time, with hypocrisy, violence, and wickedness, exceeding the measure of human.

Besides which, it is reasonable to suppose that all our Lord's apostles, at the time of their ordination, were in the flower of their age; that is, neither much younger nor much older than himself, who was then in his thirty-second year. The insurrection of Judas of Galilee was produced by the census of Quirinius, U.C. 760, in the eleventh year of our Saviour's age; and if his followers consisted of men, Simon the Zealot, who could not be less than thirty when our Lord was ten years old, would not be less than fifty when our Lord was thirty: and at the age of fifty, the age when St. Paul or St. Peter was arriving at the close

of his apostolic career itself, *he* would surely be too old to be ordained one of our Lord's apostles.

The name of Zealot, then, which is found only in St. Luke, applies to the subsequent history of St. Simon; and was due to something in his character as an apostle which the modesty of St. Matthew, who was himself an apostle, and in consequence of the silence of St. Matthew, which St. Mark also, did not think proper to mention; but which St. Luke, perhaps, might very fitly allude to. The name of Cananite therefore may still have been derived from the name of his native place; in which case, his individual distinctness from any brother of our Lord will follow as matter of course*. Nor is it an improbable circumstance that, though the son of Galilean parents, he was born by accident at Canan; Canan itself not being a village of Judæa. In this case, all the rest of our Lord's apostles being Galileans by birth, it might be necessary, for the sake of distinction, to specify the contrary of him.

Hippolytus, *περὶ τῶν ιβ' ἀποστόλων*^d, asserts that Simon the Cananite, whom also he calls the son of

* Theodorit, i. 1070. in Ps. lxxvii. 28: καὶ οἱ μὲν καλούμενοι ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν Ἰούδα φυλὴν πάντως εἶχον πηγὴν Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Ἀνδρέας καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδᾶ τῆς κώμης ἐτύχχανον ὄντες· Ματθαῖος δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβος ἐν τῇ Καπερναοὺμ διάγειν ἱστοροῦνται· Σίμων δὲ ὁ Ζηλωτὴς Κανανίτης ὠνόμασται· ταῦτα δὲ πάντα χωρία τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐστί: whence it appears that Theodorit understood the appellation in question as designating the birthplace of Simon; though he also considered it to be in Galilee; most probably

Cana—where too the author of the Apocryphæ Apostolicæ Historiæ, lib. vi. cap. 1. Codex Apocryphus, 591, supposes him to have been born, and thence to have been called *Chananæus*. Cf. cap. vii. p. 608. *Καναναῖος*, indeed, is a various reading, in Griesbach, ad Marc. iii. 18, and *Καναναῖος* or *Χαναναῖος*, another ad Matt. x. 4. Suidas has a gloss, voce *Κεννήτης*: ἀπὸ τόπου, which I should think referred to this denomination; and therefore I would read in Suidas, *Κανανίτης* or *Κενανίτης*, for *Κεννήτης*.

^d Operum i. Appendix, 30.

Cleopas, was the next bishop of Jerusalem after James the Just; and that he died at the age of one hundred and twenty. By the *Chronicon Paschale*^e, his death is placed in the consulate of Syrianus or Suburanus, and Marcellus; which answers to U. C. 857, the seventh of Trajan. The same *Chronicon* makes him a martyr; but Hippolytus, as before quoted, implies that he died a natural death: and there are other circumstances of difference between them, which prove that the *Chronicon* did not borrow the tradition from Hippolytus: for it calls this Simon the son of James, not of Cleopas; and it speaks of the martyrdom of Simon the son of Cleopas, under the next year.

It is manifest then that either in these traditions Simon the Cananite, and Simon the reputed son of Cleopas, with their respective personal history, have been strangely confounded together; or it must have been the case, and tradition must in some way or other have perpetuated the fact, that they were each of them bishops of Jerusalem after St. James; and each died at the age of one hundred and twenty; under the reign of Trajan. There is no impossibility in these suppositions; if we assume only that Simon the Cananite succeeded to James the Just, and then Simon the reputed son of Cleopas to him: and that the former died about the seventh, the latter suffered martyrdom in the eighteenth or nineteenth of Trajan. Simon the Cananite might be born U. C. 738 or U. C. 739; in which case he might be said to be one hundred and twenty years old, U. C. 857: and Simon, the reputed son of Cleopas, might be born U. C. 751 or U. C. 752; in which case he might be said to be of the same age, U. C. 868 or U. C. 869. Nor is it improbable that Simon the Cananite was a son of Cleo-

pas ; and that this circumstance caused the other Simon to be considered so likewise. If Cleopas was the brother of Joseph, and Joseph was past the prime of life at the time of the birth of our Saviour, Cleopas might be so too ; and therefore it would be nothing incredible that he should then have a son ; nor that that son should be nine or ten years old. Moreover, Simon the Cananite might actually die in the tenth of Trajan, U. C. 860 ; but Simon, the reputed son of Cleopas, not until his eighteenth or nineteenth : which would so far account for the confusion respecting that fact also. In this case, Simon the Cananite would be born U. C. 740 : and be ten years older than our Lord.

These points then being presumptively established, I shall conclude with observing that those who are called Matt. xiii. 56, Mark vi. 3, the sisters of our Lord, might be either his sisters, or merely his cousins, as they were the children of Mary the Virgin, or of Mary the mother of James. But I incline to the latter supposition ; because, at the time of the visit to Nazareth, these ἀδελφαὶ are said all to be *there*, that is, to be living there ; but no such thing is implied of the ἀδελφοὶ also : and in fact, they who were called by this name, Mark iii. 21, and iii. 31, only a day or two before this visit, are seen to have been in Capernaum ; and if we compare John vii. 3, the scene of which is Capernaum, they were actually settled there, and the mother of our Lord was living with them. I consider this then a strong proof of the distinctness of families ; that those who are called the ἀδελφοὶ of our Lord, with his mother, were living in Capernaum, at the very time when those, who are called his ἀδελφαὶ, were living without her at Nazareth. And it is in unison with this distinctness that, John ii. 12, though our Lord, his mother, and his brethren are all said to have gone

down to Capernaum, his sisters are not. Mary the wife of Cleopas and her husband, might possibly be inhabitants of Nazareth: the latter in particular, if he was a kinsman of Joseph, might be a native of it. His wife on the contrary might be a native, and before her marriage with him, an inhabitant of Cana; and that might be the reason why, though Cleopas lived at Nazareth, their marriage was celebrated there. It was the custom of the Jews to celebrate a marriage among and with rather the friends of the female, than those of the male*.

* It is, I admit, an objection to the probability of the conjecture here advanced, that Cleopas is supposed to be married to Mary, the mother of James, A. D. 27, at a time when Simon the Cananite, if a son of his, was forty years of age. What then would be the age of Cleopas? Perhaps not less than sixty or seventy. Still even Joseph was probably as old when he was married to the Virgin. And the difficulty, such as it is, is due chiefly to the supposition

that Simon, at his death, whether in the eighth or the tenth of Trajan, was 120 years old. Now this is a statement which might be made concerning him, from confounding his personal history with that of the other Simon. The numeral reading in Hippolytus, *περὶ τῶν ιβ'*, viz. *ρκ'*, may be corrupted for *ρ'*, or *ρ'*, or even for *ρ'*. In this case Simon might be about thirty, A.D. 27, and his father about fifty or sixty; not too old to marry again.

DISSERTATION XVIII.

On the visit of the Magi.

OF the questions connected with this visit, and properly concerning an Harmony, viz. the time of the appearance of the star, and that of the arrival of the Magi ; the latter is to be determined principally by the help of the former : with respect to which, it is possible to establish a maximum—that is, to shew before what time the star could not have appeared—if not a minimum, or the very time when it actually appeared. In order to this, we must reason as follows.

When the Magi were come to Jerusalem, Herod, having privately sent for them, *ἠκρίβωσε παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος*^a; the answer to which inquiry would ascertain this time ; and shew how long before their arrival the star had first been seen. Upon this information he proceeded in limiting the age of the children : it was, *κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων*^b. The age of the children therefore had a certain relation to what we may call the age of the star ; and if the former can once be determined in either of its extreme limits, the latter is so far determined likewise.

St. Matthew has defined this age by *ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω*^c. The order was limited to children of two years old and under ; that is, it was limited at one extreme, but not at the other : a child above two years old would be exempted from it, a child of two years old, or of any age less than that, would be included in it. Now it was a maxim among the Jews that the son

^a Matt. ii. 7.

^b ii. 16.

^c ii. 16.

of a *day* was the son of a *year*: Unus dies in anno habetur pro anno integro. The age of puberty was reckoned in a male, at thirteen years and a day; and in a female, at twelve years and a day^d: a ram or any animal was considered *bimus* or two years old, which was one year and thirty days old, or thirteen months old in all^e. On this principle, a child of thirteen months old would answer to the limit ἀπὸ διευτοῦς, as well as a child of full two years*. And when it is considered that the phrase ἀπὸ διευτοῦς is used here, to fix the *beginning* of a scale of descent; and as understood in its most general, or in its most particular sense, might vary at least to the extent of ten months: it will appear only reasonable to conclude that the first age which, in the popular mode of reckoning, would correspond to the limit prescribed, was the age primarily and properly intended. Now this is the age of thirteen months. Nor is the testimony of Macrobius, while it confirms the material fact, at variance with such a limitation. Cum audisset, (Augustus,) inter pueros, quos in Syria Herodes rex Judæorum intra bimatum jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait: Melius est Herodis porcum esse (τὸν ὕν) quam filium^f (τὸν υἱόν.) This expression, intra bimatum, is exactly equivalent to St. Matthew's ἀπὸ διευτοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω.

If, then, the order respecting the children was strictly framed in accordance to the information obtained about the age of the star; the utmost limit of the age of the one is the utmost limit of the age of the other: that is, if thirteen months was the utmost limit of the age of the children, the star could not have appeared more

* Aristotle, περὶ ζώων, ii. ii. 11: φος κατ' ἔτος, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ διευτοῦς: ἀποβάλλει δὲ τὰ κέρατα μόνος ὁ ἔλα- which means *in its second year*.

^d Maimonides, De Bestiarum Consecratarum Mutatione, Annot. ad i. 8. ^e De ratione Sacrificiorum, i. 14. ^f Saturnalia, ii. 4.

than thirteen months before the arrival of the Magi, though it might have appeared less.

The quarter whence the Magi came is not specified, except in general terms, as somewhere in the east. Justin Martyr and Tertullian suppose it to have been Arabia; but more, as it will appear on referring to the passages which contain this opinion*^g, to shew the fulfilment of certain alleged prophecies, than from any knowledge of the fact. From the time of Zoroaster downwards to the age of Christianity itself, the parts beyond the Euphrates—Persia, Bactria, or Parthia—had always been the chief seats of the Magian philosophy.

Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀληθῇ μαγικὴν, ὀπτικήν ἐπιστήμην οὖσαν, ἢ τὰ φύσεως ἔργα τρανωτέραις φαντασίαις ἀνγάζεται, σεμνὴν καὶ περιμάχητον δοκοῦσαν εἶναι, οὐκ ἰδιῶται μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ βασιλεῖς, καὶ βασιλέων οἱ μέγιστοι, καὶ μάλισθ' οἱ Περσῶν, διαπονοῦσιν οὕτως, ὥστ' οὐδένα φασὶν ἐπὶ βασιλείαν παραληφθῆναι δύνασθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς, εἰ μὴ πρότερον τοῦ μάγων γένους κεκοινηκώς πως τυγχάνοι †^h.

* Vide Tertullian, i. 149. 150. Contra Marcionem, iii. 13: also Operum ii. 304, Adv. Judæos, 9: where he applies Isaiah viii. 4: Zech. xiv. 14: Ps. lxxii. 10, to the visit of the Magi in question. And on the same principle, on which he supposes the presents of the Arabian Magi to stand for the spoils of Damascus, he considers also Herod to represent the king of Assyria.

† Nec quisquam rex Persarum potest esse, qui non ante Mago- rum disciplinam scientiamque perceperit: Cicero, De Divina-

tionem, i. 41. Cf. Pliny, H. N. xxx. 1. 2: Diogenes Laertius, Vitæ Phil. Proœmium, §. 2: Strabo, xi. 9. §. 3. 502: Apuleius, De Magia Oratio, Operum ii. 30: Origen, Contra Celsum, i. 58. 59. 61: Clemens Alex. i. 56. l. 18: 206. l. 36: 359. l. 14: 515. l. 4: 533. l. 17: Tertullian, i. 23. Contra Marcionem, i. 13: Eusebius, Evangelica Præp. i. 10. 42. A: Porphyrius, De Abstinencia, lib. iv. cap. 16: Prudentius, Cathemerinôn, xii. 25: Apotheosis, 611: Ammianus Marcellinus, xxiii. 6. 373—375.

^g Justin Dialogus, 304. l. 5—309. l. 1: 366. l. 10—16. Cf. Eusebius, Dem. Evang. lib. vii. 331. A. ^h Philo Judæus, ii. 316. 17. De Specialibus Legibus. Vide also, ii. 456. 44. Quod omnis probus liber. Ἐν Πέρσαις μὲν τὸ Μάγων, κ, τ. λ.

That the Magi in the present instance came accordingly from those regions, which are nearly as much to the east of Judæa as Arabia, has been uniformly the tradition of the Church. Theophylact, (after Chrysostom) observes upon the star; ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βορείου μέρους, ὃ ἐστὶ τῆς Περσίδος, εἰς τὸ νότιον ἐκινεῖτοⁱ. But if this was the case, the length of their journey, or the time for which they would be on the road, may presumptively be determined.

I. By Herodotus, a day's journey on foot is computed at 150 stades, and the distance from Sardis to Susa is stated to be exactly a three months' journey^k.

II. Xenophon makes the distance from Ephesus, to Cunaxa in the plain of Babylon, a distance of 535 parasangs; which, on the usual computation of thirty stades to a parasang, and 150 stades, as according to Herodotus, to a day's journey, would be a journey of 107 days, or three months, and seventeen days at least^l.

III. The march from Tarsus in Cilicia to Bactria is computed, by Diodorus Siculus, at four months for an army^m.

IV. The Jews, from beyond the Euphrates, in their annual visits to Jerusalem, according to Philo, had δυσβάτους, καὶ ἀτριβεῖς, καὶ ἀνηνύτους ὁδοὺς περαιούσθαιⁿ.

V. Ἦδη δέ τινες, says Josephus, καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ Εὐφράτην, μνηῶν ὁδὸν τεσσάρων ἐλθόντες, κ', τ. λ^o.

VI. Tiridates, when he came to Rome, U. C. 819, in the reign of Nero, to receive the investiture of Armenia, had been nine months previously on the road^p. Five of these might be taken up in travelling to Italy

ⁱ Operum i. 11. A. Cf. Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 56. l. 18: 206. 36: 359. 14: 515. 4: 533. 17: Irenæus, iii. x. 213: xviii. 240: Chrysostom, Operum vii. 87. B. in Matt. Homilia vi. 2: Prudentius, Cathemerinôn xii. 25: Apotheosis, 611. ^k v. 53. ^l Anabasis, ii. 2. §. 6. ^m xiv. 20. ⁿ Philo, ii. 578. 12. De Virtutibus. ^o Ant. Jud. iii. xv. 3. ^p Dio, lxiii. 2. 1.

from Asia Minor^q: the preceding four therefore were taken up in arriving in Asia from Parthia.

VII. Nehemiah set out from Susa in the month Nisan; and in three days' time after his arrival at Jerusalem, he began the rebuilding of the walls; which he finished in fifty-two days after, by the twenty-fifth of Elul, the sixth month in the sacred year^r. Consequently he could not have been less than three months, and probably was as much as four in travelling to Jerusalem*. Cf. Jos. Ant. Jud. xi. v. 7, 8.

* I think it of so much importance to establish the positions, respecting the days of the week, and other points, formerly discussed in the twelfth Dissertation, volume i; that whatever opportunity for this purpose the course of the subject may present, I ought not to let slip. The allusion to the mission of Nehemiah furnishes me with one among others, of which I shall avail myself accordingly.

The year of the mission of Nehemiah I assume to be B.C. 444. In the year after that, B.C. 443, according to Pingré, the moon was eclipsed for the meridian of Jerusalem, April 4, 7. 57. in the evening. Add to this time ten days, twenty-one hours of mean time; and B.C. 444 the moon must have been at the full, April 15, 4. 57. in the evening. Let this date coincide in that year with the fifteenth of the Jewish Nisan.

Between April 15, B.C. 444, *inclusive*, and April 15, A.D. 1, *exclusive*, the interval of time, estimated by tropical days and

nights, amounts to 162, 167 days, fourteen hours; or 23, 166 weeks, and what may be considered six days of another week.

Now A.D. 1 the tables exhibit April 15 on Friday; which I should consider to be on Sunday. And this would be the case, if B.C. 444, April 15 had been Monday: for then A.D. 1, April 9 would be Monday, and April 15 Sunday. I assume, then, that B.C. 444, Nisan 15, coincided with Monday.

Nehemiah vi. 15, the wall of Jerusalem was finished in fifty-two days, on Elul 25. If so, it was begun upon Ab 3: for from Ab 2 *exclusive*, to Elul 25 *inclusive*, the interval is just fifty-two.

Now, from Nisan 15 *exclusive* to Ab 2 *inclusive* there would be 105 days, or fifteen weeks; whence if Nisan 15 was a Monday, Ab 3 was a Tuesday; and if the walls were begun on the third of Ab they were begun on a Tuesday. But, ii. 11, Nehemiah waited, after his arrival, three days, before he began to re-

^q Herodotus, viii. 51.

^r Neh. ii. 1. ii. 11. vi. 15.

VIII. Upon the *first* day of the *first* month, says the book of Ezra, began Ezra to go up from Babylon, and on the *first* day of the *fifth* month, came he to Jerusalem^s.

IX. The temple was destroyed at Jerusalem on the seventh day of the fifth month; and Ezekiel heard of its destruction in the land of Chaldæa from one who had escaped, on the fifth day of the tenth month^{* t}.

build them. This may imply that he arrived on the Friday, and began the work on the Tuesday following; for then he would wait only three days, though three days exactly between. Moreover if the walls were completed in fifty-two days, or seven weeks' and three days' time, the last day of the number, Elul 25, would be a Thursday, because the first, Ab 3, was a Tuesday.

On the same principle the first of Tisri, viii. 2, would be a Wednesday; and therefore the twenty-fourth would be a Friday. Now this day was a *fast*, ix. 1, and as it would seem from x. 31, it was also some day not long before the sabbath. Constitutiones Apostolicæ, vii. 23, the regular fast days of the Jews are called the *second* and the *fifth* days of the week. Hence, Epiphanius, Operum i. 34. B. De Phariseis, ἐνήστευον δὲ δις τοῦ σαββάτου, δευτέραν καὶ πέμπτην: and Theophylact, i. 434. E. in Luc. xviii: ἐνήστευον δ' ἄρα οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δευτέραν καὶ πέμπτην. Cf. also the Hypomnesticon of Josephus, v. cxlv. 332. Yet, Vita Jos. 56: there is an account of a fast, proposed to be kept on the *Monday*, (53. 54. 55.) which was evi-

dently an *extraordinary* one. If so, the Monday was not a regular fast day, nor, consequently, so far as the same tradition couples them together, the Thursday. From ix. 1, 2, 3, we may perhaps infer that the fast in this instance fell on the Friday. For, as the reading of the law took up one *fourth* part of the day, and confession took up another; then whether this ceremony began at the first hour of the day, or at the third, it lasted in either case six hours, but no more; and it broke off either at the sixth hour or at the ninth. The prayer, and the sealing of the covenant, appear to have followed directly after, and concluded the whole; all, as we may conjecture, just before the arrival of the sabbath.

* With regard to the date here exhibited, It came to pass in the *twelfth* year of our captivity, in the *tenth* month, in the *fifth* day of the month, that one that had escaped out of Jerusalem came unto me, saying, The city is smitten—a comparison with xxiv. 1. 2. 26. 27, will render it probable that the *twelfth* year is an error for the *eleventh*. The siege is supposed to begin

^s Ezra vii. 9. ^t 2 Kings xxv. 8, 9. Ezek. i. 3. xxxiii. 21. 22. xxiv. 20—27. Zechar. viii. 19.

If the Magi then came from that part of the East, they would be four months on the road; and therefore if the star had appeared thirteen months before they arrived at Jerusalem, it had appeared nine months before they set out. Hence, if they set out at the time of the birth of Christ, the star must have appeared at the Incarnation*.

in the *ninth* year of Ezekiel's captivity, on the *tenth* day of the *tenth* month: as the history shews it to have begun in the *ninth* of the reign of Zedekiah, on the same day of the same month. If so, the *eleventh* of Ezekiel's captivity would synchronize with the *eleventh* of Zedekiah; and the city being taken in the *fifth* month of the latter, was taken in the *fifth* month of the former. The news then of its capture might easily be brought to Ezekiel in Chaldæa, by one who had escaped out of Jerusalem, in the *tenth* month of the same year. But to suppose it was not brought to him in Chaldæa, by one who had escaped at the time of its capture, to carry him word thereof, under a year and five months after the event, is too improbable to be admitted. Yet Jerome (*Operum* iii. 937. *ad calcem*) recognises the antiquity of the present reading: *Ex quo ostenditur, post unum annum, et quattuor menses, et viginti quinque dies, capta Jerusalem, venisse Babylonem unum civium Jerusalem, qui nunciaret captam urbem atque vastatam.*

* Xenophon, *Cyri Disc.* i. i. §. 3, and viii. ii. §. 9, the dominions of the kings of Persia are spoken of as many days', and even many months', journey distant asun-

der. Photii *Bibliotheca*, p. 45. l. i Codex 72: the Persica of Ctesias closed with a general statement, relating to this question; which, had Photius specified its details, would have thrown much light upon it. He thus sums it up: ἀπὸ Ἐφέσου μέχρι Βάκτρων καὶ Ἰνδικῆς ἀριθμὸς σταθμῶν, ἡμερῶν, παρασάγγων; but without giving us the particulars of the calculation. It may be inferred, however, from a number of passages in Strabo's *Geographica*, (ii. 214-242: xvi. cap. 1. sect. 12. 266: sect. 22. 287, 288: sect. 27. 293. sqq.: cap. 4. sect. 2. 389: sect. 4. 394: Cf. xv. cap. 1. sect. 11. 20: sect. 36. 79,) that the entire distance, which one would have to travel, who came from Persia, Bactria, or Parthia, to Judæa, would not be much less than 20,000 stadia, or 2000 English miles: which, at the rate of twenty miles a day, would require one hundred days, and at the rate of fifteen, one hundred and thirty, and upwards; and might be called in general terms a four months' journey. Cf. Strabo, xv. cap. 1. §. 12. 22, where Nearchus expresses by a four months' journey what Megasthenes and Deïmachus expressed by 20,000 stades and upwards.

Diodorus Sic. xix. 17: the extremities of Persia alone are

They came to Judæa in consequence of the appearance of the star: Where is the King of the Jews? for

said to be a month's journey distant from each other; and (cap. 19.) from the Tigris to Ecbatana in Media, by the usual route or king's highway, it was forty days' journey. And (capp. 21-25.) he gives instances of marches, from one part of the country to another, not a fourth part of the whole distance from Media or Persia to Judæa, which it took three or four weeks to perform. Cf. Strabo xv. cap. 2. §. 10. 180, and cap. 3. §. 1. 194.

Lucian, *Rhetorum Præcepta*, Operum iii. cap. 4, p. 5, speaking of the progress which couriers would make, equipped for dispatch, and taking the shortest way, yet says: ἐκ Περσῶν δὲ πολλὴ ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἐγένετο ἡ ὁδός· ἐκπεριῦναι γὰρ ἔδει τὰ ὄρη, εἶτα διὰ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας εἰς τὴν Ἀραβίαν ἐλθεῖν· εἶτα ἐρήμην πολλὴν ἐλάσαντας ἀφικέσθαι ποτὲ μόλις ἐς Αἴγυπτον, ἑικοσι μηκίστους ἀνδρὶ εὐζώνῳ σταθμοὺς τούτους διανύσαντας: which I understand to imply that the last part of the journey only, through the desert as such, would require twenty very long days' journey, for an active and expeditious traveller.

If the author of the *Itinerarium Alexandri* (published by Angelo Maio, in 1817) is to be believed, (and the work, in other respects, is a sufficiently grave and credible history,) cap. 119, he tells us, it took Alexander ninety days' journey without intermission, to travel from Babylon to the *Columnæ Herculis*; which the next chapter proves to mean not the *Columnæ Herculis* at the straits of Gibraltar, but on

the Pontus. That there were such even there is shewn by Servius ad *Æneid.* xi. 262: *Columnas Herculis legimus et in Ponto et in Hispania.* Yet even this is mentioned as an extraordinary undertaking, and one of great dispatch.

Cleomedes, περὶ μετεώρων, ii. i. §. 73, informs us that Xerxes communicated the news of the capture of Athens to his subjects in Susa, in two days' and nights' time; messengers having been previously stationed between Athens and Susa, at a convenient distance from each other. It is needless to add that this story is entitled to little belief. Cf. however, Diod. Sic. xix. 17.

Upon the question, in general, relating to the distance of the parts beyond the Euphrates, from Jerusalem, the reader will find a *locus classicus* in Chrysostom, Ad Stagirium, lib. ii. 6. (Operum i. 188. D—190. D.) though too long to be conveniently extracted. He is discussing, in fact, this very point, with a view to illustrate the more strongly the faith of Abraham, in undertaking so long a journey, and through such a country, as from Ur of Chaldæa, to the land of Canaan. And his calculation—though made in referencē to the improved state of the roads, and to the greater facilities of travelling in Chrysostom's time—yet shews it to have been even then twice thirty-five, or seventy days' journey, from Palestine merely to Chaldæa, whence Abraham was called.

we saw his star, and are come. They came thither, after his birth : Where is the King who is born ? for we are come to worship him. Now the star must have appeared, for the first time at least, either at or before or after the nativity of Christ. If it appeared *at* or *after* it, the age of the Christ, at the time of their arrival, could not be less than thirteen months ; a conclusion which would involve the Gospel chronology in insuperable difficulties. But if it appeared before the nativity, there is no reason why it might not appear at the Incarnation. The idea of an early appearance is nothing new, but as old as the time of Chrysostom^u : and in fact seems to have been the traditionary opinion of the church. Ὁ γὰρ ἀστήρ, πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Κύριον, ἐφάνη τοῖς Μάγοις. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔμελλον πολλὴν ἀναλίσκειν χρόνον κατὰ τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν, διὰ τοῦτο πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐφάνη ὁ ἀστήρ, ὥς αὖ προσκυνήσωσιν αὐτὸν ἔτι ἐν τοῖς σπραγάνοις ὄντα^v.

I consider it unnecessary to enter on the question what the star itself might be. It was manifestly something preternatural, and yet might be truly a luminous appearance, in the form of a star*. But whatsoever it was, we can scarcely doubt whether the Magi were aware of its meaning or not ; and still less, if it was really a luminous phenomenon resembling a star, whether they could have divined its meaning for themselves. A star, it is true, in the symbolical language of eastern mythology, and even in the symbolical language of prophecy^w, might be the emblem of a God ;

* Origen was of opinion that the star was a comet ; and quotes Chæremon the Stoic, De Cometis, to prove that comets were

not invariably the harbingers of evil. Vide Operum i. 373. C. E. Contra Celsum, i. 58, 59.

^u Operum vii. 108. A. in Matthæum Homilia vii. 3.
^w Numb. xxiv. 17. Amos v. 26. Isaiah xiv. 12.

^v Theophylact,

these Magi also, though it is clear they were not Jews, might yet have been acquainted with the Jewish scriptures, and partakers in the general expectation of the Messiah, which at this period had been diffused over the East. This however must always be an uncertain point; though Origen^x supposes them possessed of the prophecies of Balaam; and Theophylact goes even further than that: λέγουσι τούτους τοὺς Μάγους τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ἀπογόνους εἶναι τοῦ μάντεως· εὐρόντας δὲ τὸν ἐκείνου χρησμὸν, τό· ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ· νοῆσαι τὸ κατὰ Χριστὸν μυστήριον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐλθεῖν, θέλοντας ἰδεῖν τὸ τεχθέν^y. From *their* part in the transaction, it seems much more clear that they acted throughout as instruments. They knew, from some assurance or other, before their arrival, that the Christ had actually been born; but they did not know where: they came to Jerusalem, in the expectation of finding, or of hearing of him there; but they did not go to Bethlehem until they were sent. They came therefore with a full conviction of the fact of the birth of the Messiah in general; but with an entire ignorance, as yet, of all its circumstances. It is most reasonable then to conclude, that they were directed throughout by an express command from God: nor is a special revelation more incompatible with the beginning, than with the end of the same transaction. They were supernaturally assisted in their researches after the Christ; and they were supernaturally admonished what to do when they had found him: it is not less credible that they were supernaturally instructed in the meaning of

^x Contra Celsum, i. 59, 60: Operum i. 374. E. See also In Numeros Homilia xiii. 7. Operum ii. 321. F: xv. 4. Ibid. 328. A. B: which makes them descendants of Balaam: Hieronymus, Operum iii. 182. *ad med.* in Isa. xix: Basil, Operum i. 591. A. B. Hom. xxv: Diodorus, apud Photium, Bibl. Codex 223. page 222. 17—35. ^y Operum i. 10. E. Ibid. 13. C. D. Comm. in locum.

the star at first. In this case, though it had appeared at the Incarnation, they would not set out until the Nativity.

But the truth appears to me to be this. The star, which had been seen first at the Incarnation, was seen again at the birth of Christ; in the former instance to announce the beginning of this great mystery, in the latter to notify its consummation; the one consequently thirteen months, the other four, before the time of the arrival of the Magi at Jerusalem. No supposition is better adapted to explain the peculiarity of Herod's order; why the age of the children was not to exceed thirteen months, but might be any number of months below that. He inquired about the age of the star solely with a view to the age of the Christ; and if the star had appeared once thirteen months, and a second time four months, before the arrival of the Magi, he would not be able to determine which of these appearances intimated the real age of the Christ: and therefore by way of precaution, and little solicitous how many more innocent victims might be sacrificed to his cruel policy, he would naturally so frame his order as to take in children of every age, beginning with those of thirteen months old, indiscriminately.

Every special dispensation of Providence must have a special purpose in view; and that, an adequate and satisfactory purpose. In this visit and adoration of the Magi, the unanimous judgment of the Christian Church has long since discovered the first distinct intimation of that great mystery or secret, the communication of Gospel privileges to the Gentile. Regarded in this point of view, the advent of these strangers from the East becomes wonderfully ennobled. They are no longer simple individuals, but the first fruits of the Gentile Church. The manifestation of the

Christ to them is the manifestation of the Redeemer; the adoration which they pay him is not mere homage, but religious worship. Nor is it less observable, that in all their leading steps, the economy of Divine grace with respect to the Gentiles, and the economy of the same grace with respect to the Jews, run parallel to each other. An angel announces the Incarnation to the Virgin; and a star, the message of which is as intelligible as that of an angel, announces it to the Gentiles. A similar angelic vision apprises the shepherds, and a second appearance of the star informs the Magi, of the birth of the Christ. He is presented in the temple, and so far manifested to the Jews first; but he is made known to the Magi, and so far revealed to the Gentiles also, directly after. He is preached to the Jews for a certain time by his apostles, exclusively; at the end of this time he is preached also to the Gentiles; until at last, when every distinction has been successively levelled, both the Jew and the Gentile are made one, in the unity of a common faith in Christ.

I shall conclude then with one more remark. The case of Ezra, in particular, among the other instances cited above, proves it to be possible that a person, setting out from the parts beyond the Euphrates, on a certain day in the *first* month, might arrive at Jerusalem exactly on the same day in the *fifth* month of the Jewish year. Hence if the Magi set out on the tenth of Nisan, U. C. 750, they might arrive in Jerusalem on the tenth of Lous, or Ab, the fifth month afterwards. The tenth of Nisan, in that year, as it has been abundantly proved elsewhere^z, coincided with April 6; and consequently the tenth of Ab would coincide with August 2. April 6 in that year, was a Sunday, and August 2 was a Saturday. We may consider it probable, that in one

^z Vol. i. 402. Dissertation xii.

week's time after this, consequently about August 9 or 10, the Holy family would set out for Egypt; where they would perhaps arrive at the place of their abode, August 25 or 26. From this time to March 31, the date of the next Passover, the included term of days is as nearly as possible 215 in all. Vide vol. i. Dissertation xii. page 394, note.

DISSERTATION XIX.

On the ministry of John the Baptist.

OF the two questions, which naturally belong to the consideration of this subject, first, the question of the entire duration of the ministry of John; and secondly, that of the order or distribution of its parts: the former has been in a great measure anticipated. The entire duration of the ministry of John was necessarily comprehended between the feast of Tabernacles, when we supposed it to begin, and the day of his imprisonment; both in the thirteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar.

The precise day of the imprisonment of the Baptist may justly be regarded as unknown, and always to be so; yet we shall see reason perhaps hereafter to believe that it must have fallen out sometime before the midsummer of U. C. 780, in the last half of Tiberius' thirteenth^a; and it may be shewn in a future dissertation^b that, whensoever it fell, it was on some day between the Passover, John ii. 13, and the feast of Pentecost, next after that; which being the case, even the day itself may not improbably be conjectured.

The ministry of John being entirely preparatory to the ministry of Jesus Christ, the close of the one was either virtually or actually the commencement of the other; and conversely, the commencement of the one determined either virtually or actually the close of the other. Now the ministry of Jesus Christ had a two-fold commencement; once in Judæa, at the Passover, John ii. 13, before the imprisonment of John, and again in Galilee, after it; at the former of which the ministry of John was over virtually, and at the latter

^a Vide the Appendix.

^b Dissertation xxi.

was over actually. Answerable to this twofold beginning, the ministry of Christ had a twofold conclusion also; once, at the Passover in the sixteenth of Tiberius, when he suffered; and again, on the day of the Ascension, before which he was not finally removed into heaven. The interval between these two, which was a period of forty-one days, was similarly employed, according to St. Luke, with the whole course of his ministry preceding; viz. in shewing himself to the Apostles, and telling them of the things which concerned the kingdom of God^c: and consequently, though the personal ministry of Christ after his death and resurrection, until his reception into heaven, was strictly confined to his own disciples, and was no longer transacted in public; yet, as regards that one particular of subserviency to the preparation for the future dispensation of the Gospel, which had always been its object before; it must be considered to have continued still.

Between the first beginning and the first termination of our Lord's ministry, there was an interval of three years exactly; and between the second beginning and the second termination, if they both coincided with Ascension-day, there was the same. Now this duration of the ministry of Christ, from whatever point of time we deduce its commencement, seems to have been a necessary consequence in order to the fulfilment of prophecy. If then it was finally and properly closed on the day of the Ascension, in the sixteenth of Tiberius, U. C. 783; we may infer that it finally and properly began at the same time, in his thirteenth, U. C. 780. But it did not finally and properly begin, except after the imprisonment of John. I advance it therefore as a probable conjecture, that the day of the imprisonment of John, U. C. 780, was the same

^c Acts i. 3.

day in that year, on which our Saviour ascended into heaven three years afterwards, U.C. 783. This was in each case about the forty-first day from the fourteenth of the Jewish Nisan. The entire duration of the ministry of John must be determined accordingly; and if we date its commencement with the feast of Tabernacles preceding, it occupied about seven months in all. On this point however something more will be said hereafter.

The second question, or that which concerns the order and distribution of the parts of the ministry of John, pre-supposes the whole to have been directed to more than one purpose; and the separate discharge of its functions in general to have begun at different periods: and as this appears to me to be the truth of the case, I shall enter upon the proof of it somewhat at large.

With this view I observe that, if the ministry of John the Baptist was really subservient to distinct offices; both what these were, and in what they differed from each other, is presumptively to be collected from what the accounts of his ministry describe him to have done: and this presumption is so far confirmed by the matter of fact, that, little as each of the evangelists in particular has recorded of his ministry, that little is substantially the same in all; and furnishes the evidence of more than one effect, and consequently of more than one purpose of his mission; which, whether they were capable of being discharged at the same time, or not, were manifestly distinct in kind.

I. One and the first character, upon the public assumption of his ministerial office, in which John is represented, is the character of a κήρυξ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; that is, of an herald or proclaimer of the tidings of the kingdom; accompanied by the condition of faith, that

is, belief in the tidings, and of repentance or reformation of life, as a consequence of the belief. In those days cometh John the Baptist, κηρύσσων, *proclaiming*, in the wilderness of Judæa, and saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Matt. iii. 1, 2.

II. His next character is the character of a baptizer. Then began to go forth unto him Jerusalem, and all the land of Judæa, and all the country round about the Jordan: and were baptized by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins. Matt. iii. 5, 6.

III. Another and a third character is that of a teacher of morals, as well as of a preacher of the kingdom: nor is it any objection that his moral instructions are represented as conveyed not in long or set discourses, but in short and familiar rules of duty, applicable to the parties addressed, and easily retained in mind. Luke iii. 10—14.

IV. The fourth and the last character is that of an harbinger of the Messiah; or of one commissioned to bear express testimony to the approaching advent of the Christ. And he began to proclaim, (ἐκήρυσσε,) saying, There is coming after me He who is mightier than I; the thong of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop and unloose. I indeed have baptized you in water; but he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost. Mark i. 7, 8.

Besides these characters we meet with no more: and of these the first and the last alone are really distinct; the intermediate two are not so much different from, as natural consequences of the first. The character of a preacher of repentance could not fail to include the character of a moral teacher; and the doctrine of the kingdom as preached by John being accompanied by the requisition of repentance, grounded upon faith in the approach of the kingdom, baptism

was administered as the sign and seal of both. For the baptism of John was invariably either preceded or attended by the confession of sins; whence it is manifest that it was designed to attest and confirm the sincerity of the receiver's profession of his belief in the prediction of the approaching kingdom; and in the assurance of that belief, of the truth of his purpose to lead a new life.

The administration of baptism, then, without any regard to the use of that rite among the Jews in the admission of proselytes, was a necessary part of the office of John; whether as a prophet of the kingdom, or as a teacher of morality: in which might be supposed to be comprehended the sum and effect of his ministry as both. The reception of baptism at his hands was the last and most decisive step, to declare the faith of the recipient both in the message and in the authority of John. Hence it is that the final end of his mission, so far as these objects were contemplated by it, may be fitly described as simply and solely *to baptize*: that his ministry, regarded in the complex, may be called *his baptism*; that his personal denomination, both in the Gospels and out of them, is John ὁ Βαπτιστής—John *the baptizer*—that St. Mark and St. Luke do each concisely express both his first and his second office in this *one* description, that John came preaching or proclaiming the *baptism* of repentance, unto remission of sins; and that St. Paul, in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch, employs the same language: John having proclaimed, before the face of his entrance, *baptism* of repentance to all the people^d.

Now the character in which the Baptist would first appear, it is morally certain, must be his true and his proper character; a character which, whatever

^d Acts xiii. 24.

other he might combine with it afterwards, he could never thenceforward lose, but would retain to the last. This character was the character of an herald of the kingdom : and the same character, as it may be shewn, is the character subsequently assumed by our Saviour. Ἀπὸ τότε, says St. Matthew ; that is, from the time of the return into Galilee after the imprisonment of John, and the choice of Capernaum as the place of our Lord's abode ; ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν, καὶ λέγειν· Μετανοεῖτε· ἡγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν^e.

It was in this identical form of words, that St. Matthew set forth and described just before the office and ministry of John : Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, was his account of the ministry of John ; Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, is his account of the ministry of Christ. It is the same character of the heralds or proclaimers of the gospel tidings, in which he exhibits both ; it is the same kingdom of heaven, and as still future and not yet come, which he represents to be announced by both ; it is the same practical inference of the necessity of repentance and of reformation of life, as grounded upon the futurity and the belief in the futurity of the kingdom, which he shews to be inculcated by both. If these words then were a correct description of the ministry of John, they must be a correct description of the ministry of Christ ; and if they are a correct description of the ministry of either, the ministry of the other was so far the same with it. It is impossible that the kingdom of heaven should mean one thing, as the subject of the preaching of John, and another, as the subject of the preaching of Christ ; or that the part and character of an herald, in relation to it, supported by John, should not agree to the same part and character, in

relation to it, sustained by Christ. We might as well contend that the doctrine of repentance and of amendment of life, as founded upon it by the one, was a different thing from the same doctrine, as grounded upon it by the other. Nor would it be less absurd to maintain that, if the kingdom of heaven means the same thing, as the subject of the preaching of either, it was future and not yet revealed, in the time of John, but present and actually manifested, in the time of Christ; and not that it was equally still future, though shortly to be really disclosed, at the time of the ministry of both.

Now that, in these words, St. Matthew has given us a correct and faithful, however concise a description of the office and ministry of Christ; is to be inferred not merely from *his* authority, who being a disciple and an apostle of Christ, and constantly in attendance upon him, could not be ignorant in what his ministry consisted, or how he was employed from the first: but also from the testimony of the other evangelists, and from certain facts which, as we shall see presently, transpired in the course of our Lord's ministry itself. St. Mark's account of the commencement of the same ministry, i. 14, which I have had occasion to quote elsewhere^d, is substantially to the same effect as St. Matthew's; but as being fuller and more explicit, it is so much the stronger an evidence upon the point at issue. With both also we may compare, as not many days later than either, the following text of St. Luke: To the other cities likewise must I preach the gospel of the kingdom of God; because for this purpose am I sent^e.

Now a statement of the nature, or of the functions of the ministry of Christ in general, historically premised

to the account of it in detail, must for that very reason be received as a statement of its nature, and of its functions throughout. For we cannot suppose that it was otherwise than consistent with itself from first to last ; or that its offices at one time were essentially different from its offices at another. If therefore our Saviour appeared in the proper character of an herald or ambassador of the gospel-tidings, at its commencement ; he would sustain the same character, and he must be still regarded as such an herald or ambassador, at its middle and at its close. Nor is this conclusion left to presumption merely. The cardinal points in the course of his ministry, after the time of its commencement, are the several circuits which he made of Galilee : and his employment on any one of these ought consequently to be a decisive evidence of the object of his ministry from the first. Now his employment upon them all, different as they were in themselves and distinct as they were in their times, was one and the same ; which is uniformly represented alike, and on every occasion is reducible to these three heads ; viz. of preaching or proclaiming the kingdom ; of teaching ; and of working miracles : in none of which particulars, except the last, was the ministry of Christ, as we have seen, to be distinguished from that of John. The Baptist indeed wrought no miracles ; and if we consider for what purpose miracles were now to be wrought ; viz. as an evidence that he who wrought them, or in whose name they were wrought, was the expected Messiah, and consequently after not before the personal manifestation of the Messiah himself ; John could not perhaps in conformity with his real character, and his proper order of time, have wrought miracles like Christ, or like the apostles of Christ. But, in other respects, whether as a preacher of the kingdom, or as a teacher of moral

duties, he was absolutely the counterpart, and merely the forerunner of Christ.

Again ; the mission of the Twelve, which took place about the middle of our Saviour's ministry, was the mission of helpers or coadjutors in the discharge of the functions of his ministry. The reason assigned for their mission is a clear proof of this. Seeing the multitudes and pitying their destitute condition, because they were as sheep without a shepherd, he said to his apostles : The harvest to be gathered, truly is plentiful ; but the gatherers of the harvest are few. Pray ye therefore the owner of the harvest, to send forth labourers into his harvest ^f.

It is plainly implied by these words that the work to be performed, the business of reaping the spiritual harvest, was too much for the individual exertions of one person ; and therefore required the assistance of more : but that the work itself, whether to many or to few, would be still the same. How then is the object of this errand described ? First, in the words of the charge to the apostles, Go and proclaim, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand^g ; and in the historical notice of St. Luke, that he sent them to proclaim the kingdom of God^h. Secondly, in the declaration of St. Mark, subjoined to the charge, and shewing how the commission was fulfilled ; Having gone forth, they began to preach or proclaim that men should repentⁱ. Other purposes there were to which, as the same authority shews, this mission was also directed ; and which bring it down still nearer to a conformity with the ministry of Christ. For the apostles taught as well as he, and the apostles wrought miracles as well as he. But the above statements are sufficient to prove that the business of our Lord's personal ministry at its middle period was still

^f Matt. ix. 36—38.

^g Matt. x. 7.

^h Ch. ix. 2.

ⁱ Ch. vi. 12.

what it had been at first ; and St. Matthew tells us that, while the Twelve were thus employed in one direction by themselves, our Saviour was similarly employed in another by himself : that is—that all, though in different directions, were similarly employed at once^k.

Again ; about a year after this time, and probably not more than two months before the last Passover, the Seventy also were sent out : in the account of the charge to whom preparatory to their departure, as it is recorded by St. Luke^l, the words, Go ... and say, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you ; and, Be assured of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh to you ; occur twice with peculiar emphasis. The errand then of these apostles was still the same with the errand of the Twelve, one year before ; with the ministry of our Lord at its commencement ; and with the commission of John from the first : viz. to preach the gospel, strictly so called ; to publish the tidings of the approaching kingdom ; and to inculcate the great practical duty of repentance and of amendment of life, necessarily resulting from the expectation of it. The ministry of our Lord therefore at its beginning, at its middle, and at its end was still the same, and was still identified with the Baptist's. In all these instances, the kingdom of heaven or of God, which is both spoken of as something future and was actually still something future, can mean only the Gospel dispensation ; the promulgation of formal Christianity, dated from the day of Pentecost, next after the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ ; or if it does not mean that, it means absolutely nothing at all, or nothing which we could say it means.

If this however be the case ; the mission and ministry of John, as far as they were subservient to this

^k Matt. xi. 1.

^l Ch. x. 5. 9. 11.

future dispensation, were the same in kind with the mission and ministry of our Lord himself, of the Twelve, and of the Seventy, respectively, during the lifetime of Christ. They differed from each other in nothing except the order and succession of time: each in his own place, though a distinct place from that of another, was still an harbinger in common of the same future kingdom. And this conclusion is irresistibly enforced by the fact, that our Saviour's own part and agency in this common commission begin with no delay after the absolute termination of John's: but not before. No sooner was the Baptist imprisoned, and consequently debarred from the discharge of his proper work any longer; than our Lord stepped in and supplied his place. Nothing could more clearly intimate the identical nature of their respective missions, the community of end and purpose, to which the personal ministry of either was directed. For Christ, as we have seen, succeeded not merely to the place, but to the very language and proclamation of John; which was as good as to declare that, though the agent was changed, the thing done was not altered: the voice of the same proclamation, the dictates of the same awful warning, might still be heard; the mouth of the harbinger, the authority of the teacher only, were distinct. It was John who had pronounced them before; it was the Christ who repeated them now: it was the servant of the Messiah who promulgated the command to believe and to repent, at first; it was the Lord of that servant, it was the Messiah himself, who was reiterating and enforcing it after him.

I am not aware that, as far as we have yet compared them together, there was any difference between the personal ministry of John, and the personal ministry of Jesus Christ, except this; that John baptized,

but Jesus Christ did not baptize. Even during the interval, short as it was, for which our Lord's ministry ran parallel to that of John, though his disciples, as the Evangelist tells us^m, baptized, yet Jesus himself, as he also tells us, did not: and after the commencement of his own ministry, posterior to the imprisonment of John, until the day of Pentecost and thenceforward, we read no more of baptism as administered even by the disciples of Christ. I think we may infer from these facts that it was at no period, in his public career, proper for our Lord himself to baptize; nor for his disciples at any period, except during the interval between the first Passover, and the final return into Galilee; (when John also was still making converts as before;) to do so in the same sense and to the same effect with John; that is, with water, as the sign and seal of repentance.

The reason of this difference in two offices, the separate functions of which were otherwise so much the same, appears to me to be in each instance one the reverse of the other: and consequently in both to be very nearly connected together. John baptized, and that with water, because he was not to baptize with the Holy Ghost; Christ did not baptize with water, because he was to baptize with the Holy Ghost. The water-baptism then of John was typical of the Spirit-baptism of Christ; and water, as the medium of the baptism of John, was analogous to the Holy Ghost, as the medium of the baptism of Christ. So far therefore from introducing a real difference into the office of John, as compared with the office of Christ, this distinction brings them nearer to a resemblance than before; making the Baptist so exactly the counterpart of Christ, that even that most important particular in the functions of the latter,

^m John iv. 2.

the mission and effusion of the Holy Ghost, was not without its significant prototype in the functions of the former. And this may be one reason why the baptism of John, though, as conveyed by the same external medium, but destitute of the same inward grace, it might so far appear the appropriate emblem of Christian baptism in general, should be considered in reality no type nor similitude of *that* sacrament; but only of the *one* baptism, once for all administered at the day of Pentecost by Christ himself upon the first Christian converts, in the communication of the extraordinary graces of the Spirit; and afterwards, as often as those graces were repeated, upon all converts subsequently.

I am led to this conclusion partly by the testimony of John himself; who, on a variety of occasions, so distinguishes his own baptism from some baptism of Christ's, as shews him to have none other baptism in view, but this: I indeed have baptized you in water, but he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghostⁿ: and what is still more to the purpose, because it was literally fulfilled at the day of Pentecost when the Spirit visibly descended in the likeness of tongues of fire: I indeed am baptizing you in water; but he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire^o: partly, by the testimony of our Lord himself; who, as if expressly to remind the apostles of the typical baptism which they had heretofore received at the hands of John, tells them on the way to Bethany before his Ascension; John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Ghost, not many days hence^p: a declaration, which St. Peter afterwards applies to a case in point; the effusion of the Spirit on Cornelius and his household, even before they had been baptized with water^q: partly, from the testimony of St. Paul,

ⁿ Mark i. 8.^o Matt. iii. 11. Luke iii. 16.^p Acts i. 5.^q xi. 16.

with respect to the twelve disciples at Ephesus: John indeed baptized with baptism of repentance, telling the people that they should believe upon him who was coming after him; that is, upon Jesus, the Christ^r. For this was to imply that John had baptized with water, as the sign and seal of repentance; but that Christ should baptize with the Spirit, as the sign and seal of acceptance: and the event gave effect to his words; for as soon as these disciples had been baptized in the name of the Lord, and Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost also was poured on them, and they spake with tongues. Nor is it improbable that, among the other uses proposed by the baptism of our Lord himself, to prefigure this future truth was one; for after the water had been poured over him by John, the Holy Ghost was poured on him from above; and not only was poured upon him, but rested on him and continued with him. And if Justin Martyr is to be believed, even a more sensible indication of the same truth was at the same time given. Καὶ τότε, ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν, ἔνθα ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτιζε, κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, καὶ, κ', τ. λ^s.

The same tradition is said to have been contained in the gospel according to the Ebionites^t; between which, however, and this allusion to the same thing by Justin, there is so much of difference in the circumstances, as to prove that the latter did not take it from the former. But whatsoever may be thought of this fact, the baptism of John, which had just preceded, might be typical of that spiritual unction which followed; and both together might concur to intimate that he, who had

^r Acts xix. 4.
138. B. Ebionæi, xiii.

^s Dialogus, 331. l. 7—11.

^t Epiphanius, Operum i. There was an apocryphal work, called the Prædicatio Pauli; from which Cyprian (De Baptismo Hæreticorum) gives this extract: Item cum baptizaretur (sc. Jesus) ignem super aquam esse visum.

received not only the sign but the thing signified, if he baptized at all, would baptize not with water but with the Spirit; and having received so plenteous and withal so enduring an unction, that he should baptize with the Spirit. For it was in reference to the plenteousness of that effusion, that John afterwards said to his disciples: The Father giveth not the Spirit by measure^u: and in reference to the derived communications bestowed on the church from the same inexhaustible source, that the Evangelist, at the beginning of his Gospel, declared, Of his fulness have all we received, and grace in return for grace; that is, grace imparted to men, in return for grace received from above^v.

The identity of the ministry of John and of the ministry of Jesus Christ, in general, may be further confirmed as follows.

I. By the exordium of St. Mark's Gospel: ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις^w, κ', τ. λ. The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ was consequently the beginning of the ministry of John; and the part, subsequently discharged in the same Gospel by Jesus Christ, was similar to the part which had been previously discharged in it by John. Nor is it possible to avoid this conclusion, except by contending that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ means here no more than the tidings of the approach and manifestation of Jesus Christ; a sense which, by limiting the *gospel* entirely to the supposed ministry of John in this one respect, would lead to the absurd inference that Jesus Christ himself bore no part in the Gospel at all; and would contradict the writer to the Hebrews: πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφενξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λα-

^u John iii. 34.^v i. 16.^w i. 1, 2.

λείσθαι διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη^x.

II. By the true drift and meaning of the reply to the question, ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς^y; the peculiarity of which reply consists in *this*; that while it appears to decline, it does in reality answer the question. Our Lord indeed foreknew that his interrogators would not reply to his own question, *from heaven*; and they durst not reply to it, *from men*: he foreknew therefore that they would not reply to it at all; and this was the reason why he encountered their question by another. But suppose them to have answered, what was certainly possible, that the baptism of John was ἐξ οὐρανοῦ; then on one implicit admission; viz. that the ministry of our Saviour also was the same in kind with the ministry of John; they would have answered their question themselves. If John's ministry was from heaven, our Saviour's was so too: and he, who acted by a Divine commission, had the clearest right to do those things.

III. By a comparison of Matt. xi. 12, 13, with Luke xvi. 16: the first of which ought to be rendered thus; From the days of John the Baptist even until now, the kingdom of heaven is suffering violence, and violent ones are seizing it by force: for all the prophets, and the law, taught until John: and the second, delivered on a different and a much later occasion, in like manner should be translated thus; The law and the prophets taught until John; since then, the kingdom of heaven is a preaching of, and every one is pressing into it. So rendered and taken in conjunction, the figurative language of each of these passages describes the efforts of men, not yet in possession, but striving with all their might and main to get possession, of

^x Ch. ii. 3.

^y Matt. xxi. 23. Mark xi. 28. Luke xx. 2.

some desirable object. It would aptly, for example, personify the exertions of soldiers who, having the reduction and the spoiling of some rich but fortified place before them, are employing all the arts and expedients of war to take it; are scaling the walls, battering the gates, undermining and throwing down every obstacle which keeps them, for a time, from their prize.

It is not then implied that the kingdom of heaven was as yet subdued by this holy warfare, or that the violence of these figurative spoilers was actually crowned with success; only that it was on the point of becoming so: and the language of prophecy, which speaks of the future as already present, describes it accordingly even now. But that it does this in conformity to its own idiom merely, appears from the fact that the kingdom of heaven all the time, *εὐαγγελίζεται*; is still only preached of and announced; though every one was pressing into it. The truth is, that the very tidings or news of its approach were the producing cause of the eagerness to press into it, of the violence exerted to get possession of it: and the publication of those tidings had begun with John. The welcome, the eagerness, the impatience with which the news had been received, and the approach of the kingdom was already expected, were consequently all to be dated from the commencement of the ministry of John: but the same feelings continued to be kept up; (and that the more, the longer the arrival of the kingdom itself seemed to be delayed;) subsequently even to the commencement of the ministry of Christ.

The ministry of John therefore was the same in kind with the ministry of Christ, and was merely prior to it in the order of time; which being the case, it follows directly that the ministry of John, compared

with the ministry of any prophet who had gone before him, was something novel and *sui generis*. It might be justly said that the Law and the Prophets had all prophesied or taught, as before, until John appeared; but that since then the kingdom of heaven—a new dispensation distinct from the Mosaic, though raised up and nourished in the bosom of the Mosaic; had begun, and was continuing to be preached. The reign of the ancient dispensation, the authority of the former rule of faith, were first superseded by the advent and the ministry of John. He might be said to have stood on the middle wall of partition between the Law and the Gospel; and to have belonged alike to each; consummating the one, and introducing the other. He was neither the last in the order of the prophets, nor the first in the order of the apostles; but something made up of both. As appearing before the Messiah, he was to be classed with the prophets of the Law; and as sustaining the same office with the Messiah, he was to be classed with the emissaries of the Gospel: and on both these accounts, while he might still be the same *in genere* with the prophets, he was something in particular more than they.

IV. By the right construction and interpretation of that much disputed passage in the Gospel of St. John: ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν^z. The authorized version of this text, upon the whole, is the most correct; though, if we would do entire justice to the force and emphasis of the original terms, we must alter it slightly to the following effect: He, who is coming after me, is become before me; because he was before me. It would be just as absurd to suppose that the first half of this sentence affirms priority of existence, as that the last half affirms

^z Ch. i. 15. Cf. 27. 30.

priority of rank; for they cannot both be considered to affirm priority of the same thing, without amounting to two identical propositions; or assigning a certain truth as a reason for itself. The last clause, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν, ascertains the ground of the assertion, conveyed by the first, ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν: so that if πρῶτός μου ἦν is rightly rendered, He was before me; that is, affirms priority of existence; ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν cannot be rightly rendered, He is before me; that is, affirm priority of existence also: and if ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν is rightly rendered, He is become before me; that is, affirms priority of rank; then (though the original Greek might bear it, which I contend that it never could) πρῶτός μου ἦν cannot be rightly rendered, He was my chief; that is, affirm priority of rank.

If however the first clause affirms precedence, or priority of rank, the second may very well affirm pre-existence, or priority of being; and where the question lay between the comparative personal dignity of the Baptist and that of Christ, it might still more reasonably assign this very priority of existence, as the sole yet sufficient ground of that very priority of rank. The most superficial reader must be sensible that, by the peculiar antithesis of his language, John had it in view expressly to oppose the circumstance of Christ's being advanced before him, to the circumstance notwithstanding of his coming after him; an use of ὀπίσω, and ἔμπροσθεν, which is the most classical imaginable.

Γνώμης πατρώας πάντ' ὀπισθεν ἐστάναι. Soph. Ant. 640.

Καὶ τοὺς ὀπισθεν εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν ἄξομεν. Ajax. 1249.

. Τὰ μακρὰ τῶν σμικρῶν λόγων
ἐπίπροσθεν ἐστι, καὶ σαφὴ μᾶλλον κλύειν. Eur. Orest. 629.

Οὐδὲν ἄλλο τούτου μᾶλλον ὃν ἔμπροσθεν παραβαλὼν (ἂν) εὔροι. Dio, xlii. 56. To the effect of this antithesis, and

to render the anomaly more complete, it was evidently necessary that Christ should be understood to be coming after, in the same way and in the same sense, in which John himself had gone before ; in other words, that the personal ministry of each respectively was to be the same, differing only in the order of succession. For, generally speaking, it is the first in a common office, and not the last ; it is he who ushers in and begins a business of any importance, not he who takes it up and prosecutes it afterwards ; who may be said to have precedence, and to sustain the more dignified character of the two. But the successor of the Baptist, even in a common work, was such as by the superior lustre of his person, and by the corresponding authority of his teaching, could not fail to eclipse and to supersede his predecessor. For he who was from eternity ; he who was before the Baptist, and before every other divinely-commissioned, but merely human teacher, more ancient than the Baptist ; though he might condescend to labour in the same vocation with the Baptist, and even in an order of time posterior to his ; yet by virtue of his essential preexistence, his sublime and mysterious divinity of nature, could not possibly rank, or long continue to rank after or beneath him ; but must be preferred before him. The same assertion therefore of his own subordination to his successor, and the same reason for that subordination ; viz. that John was from the earth, Christ was from heaven ; John was from below, Christ was from above ; are not more piously, than naturally repeated in that other testimony of the Baptist's, which holds out the torch to the meaning of this. Him it behoveth to increase, but me it behoveth to decrease : he who came from above is above all things : he who was from the earth is from the earth, and speaketh from the earth ; but he who came from

the heavens is above all things, and what he hath seen and hath heard, the same he testifieth ^a.

And hence we may arrive at a right conception of that peculiar circumstance of distinction, in which the superiority of John to every prophet, who had appeared before him, must be supposed to consist; a superiority so great, that our Lord himself has said, Among them that were born of women, there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist ^b. It was no preeminence of personal sanctity, but a certain preeminence of personal office, which was thus ascribed to *him* in particular. All the prophets before him had been, in some sense, the precursors of the Messiah, as well as he; but none of them had been his immediate predecessor, like John. All the prophets before him had an high and an holy office to sustain, the same in one as in another; none had been admitted to the privilege of sustaining the same office with the Messiah, of being the fellow-labourer and as it were copartner, in his proper work and ministry, of the Lord of the prophets, but John. And in the same sense in which it might thus be said that John was superior to any prophet before him; in the same sense might it be said that the least in the kingdom of God, the least minister of the gospel, among those who should come after him, would be greater than John. For the office and part of one, who merely preceded to announce the approach of this kingdom, and to prepare men's minds for the future preaching of the gospel, could not, in the nature of things, be so dignified and illustrious, as the office and part of one, who was actually to begin, or in any way contribute to execute the predicted dispensation itself.

Nor ought it to be objected to this assertion, that

^a John iii. 30—32.

^b Matt. xi. 11.

the personal ministry of Christ himself, as being the same with the personal ministry of John, must on this principle have been inferior in dignity or in importance to the personal ministry of a Christian evangelist. It is not the inequality of personal characters, but the disparity of personal functions, relatively to a common end, which we are here contrasting together. The personal dignity of Jesus Christ can bear no comparison with that of either prophet or apostle; and as the Lord of the apostles, as well as of the prophets, by whom *they* also were commissioned and sent; who inspired *them* with the knowledge of gospel truths, and cooperated with *them* wheresoever they went; the sole and efficient cause of every thing brought to pass by *their* instrumentality and even in *their* proper vocation, was still Jesus Christ. But in every regular and orderly scheme, which has a beginning and an ending, a preparation and a consummation, leading to, yet distinct from each other; they who carry into effect must be considered to do more towards the final result than they who begin. And if the prenunciation of the gospel was to precede, as well as conduct to its preaching, it is no disparagement of the personal dignity of Christ, who, in his relative place and order of time, could discharge only the former, that his proper office was preliminary, and therefore so far subordinate to the personal office of his apostles, who were to be appointed to the latter.

The similarity indeed of the personal ministry of our Saviour to that of John, *before* him, and yet its distinctness from that of the apostles, *after* him, may be a good presumptive argument that there was something incumbent upon *him*, and to be discharged by *him*, over and above the proper work of *his* ministry; something which could be done neither by John before him, nor

by the apostles after him ; something equally necessary to the effect and completion of his own ministry, and to the commencement and discharge of their's ; something consequently which must be interposed between both ; *after* the one, but *before* the other : which something the event alone would prove to be the death and the resurrection of our Lord, with the saving design of each ; and next to this, which was to happen at the close of his personal career, the collecting, ordaining, and commissioning of apostles during its course ; who should publish these saving truths, and therefore commence their ministry, as preachers of formal Christianity, afterwards.

Lastly ; the case of Apollos, who is said to have known only the baptism of John^c ; and still more the case of the twelve disciples at Ephesus, who had been baptized only into the baptism of John^d ; are sufficient to prove that persons might be disciples, and consequently Christians in some sense or other already, who had not been fully instructed in the gospel dispensation as such ; or who had not received Christian baptism ; who were merely believers in the Divine legation of John, and had merely received baptism from John, or from some of the disciples of John. Nothing can more clearly imply the subordination of the ministry of John to the same common end with the ministry of Christ ; and that common end the dispensation of the gospel, as yet ulterior to the ministry of both.

These considerations, and others which, if they were necessary, might still be adduced, are sufficient to place it beyond a question that the personal ministry of John is not to be regarded as distinct from the personal ministry of our Saviour, except in the order of succession :

^c Acts xviii. 24, 25.

^d xix. 1—7.

that both were continuous, though individual parts of the same scheme or dispensation in general, which may be called indifferently either the Ministration of the Kingdom, or the Ministration of the Messiah; as discriminated from the propagation of formal Christianity, or the Ministration of the apostles. It may be said however that prophecy, both ancient and recent, had represented the ministry of John, in a different light; viz. as the ministry of an herald, harbinger, or precursor specially in reference to the coming of Christ; and therefore as distinct from the ministry of Christ. The voice of one, crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths^e: Behold I do send my messenger before thy face, who shall get ready thy way before thee^f: He shall be mighty before the Lord... and many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he himself shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of righteous: to prepare for the Lord a duly provided people^g. And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; for the sake of giving knowledge of salvation to his people, by the remission of their sins through the tender mercies of our God, wherewith the dayspring from on high hath visited us, to shine unto those who were sitting in the darkness and shadow of death, whereby to direct our feet safely into the way of peace^h. To which we may add the testimony of St. Paul also, as quoted aboveⁱ; viz. that John proclaimed, before the entrance of Christ, baptism of repentance unto all the people.

^e Is. xl. 3—5.^f Mal. iii. 1.^g Luke i. 15—17.^h Ib. 76—79.ⁱ Acts xiii. 24.

That John was really the precursor of Christ ; that the business of bearing witness to the Messiah was part of his commission originally ; that the fact of such witness, as delivered by him in more ways and on more occasions than one, is actually on record ; and consequently that even those descriptions, which speak of him as personally the herald of Christ, become strictly applicable to him, and are literally fulfilled in his history : no one can pretend to dispute. There was a man, says the last of the evangelists, sent from God ; his name was John. This man came for a testimony, that he might bear testimony concerning the light ; that all might believe through him^k. I was sent before the Christ, says the Baptist of himself ; and, That the Christ might be manifested to Israel, for that purpose came I, baptizing in water^l. And again ; He who sent me to baptize in water, the same said unto me, On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him ; this it is who baptizeth in the Holy Ghost^m.

The duty however of bearing personal testimony to Jesus Christ was so far from being incompatible with the duty of an evangelist of the kingdom, that, in the case at least of John, the former would necessarily be a consequence of the latter. For if John knew that, though not himself the Messiah, he was shortly to be succeeded by the Messiah, and that his own part in their common ministry was sometime to be superseded by his, he could not fail to attest this truth ; and to bid the people prepare for the coming of another, after himself but greater than himself. And this seems indeed to be the exact description of John's personal relation to Christ ; that he had to point him out as his successor in a common office, and however greater or more dignified than

^k John i. 6. 7.^l Ib. iii. 28. i. 31.^m Ib. i. 33.

himself, yet still as only his successor. In comparison then with his proper and primary commission, as a preacher of the kingdom or an ambassador of the gospel-tidings, this duty of bearing personal testimony to Jesus Christ was a kind of *παράργον*, or secondary purpose; perfectly compatible with that, yet entirely subordinate to it: which conclusion may be further supported by the following arguments.

I. If the authority of John, in his original capacity as a prophet of the kingdom, had not been already acknowledged, his personal testimony to the Messiah must clearly have failed of its effect: for what weight or sanction could be given to the character or the claims of another, by one who was still in want of confirmation for his own?

II. To suppose, for argument's sake, that this business was the great business of his ministry: the testimony of John to Christ, before and after his baptism, must necessarily have been widely different. Before that baptism, he could bear witness, if to any thing, only to the *future* approach of the Messiah; after it, to his *actual* coming; before, only to *some* Messiah in general; after, to the *person* of this Messiah in particular. Both these kinds and modes of testimony, it may be said, would be suitable to the office of one who was commissioned expressly to bear witness to the Christ; the former or the general, while he was still unknown, the latter or the particular, when he had once been ascertained. But the latter, as every one must admit, would be much the more effectual of the two, and much the more in unison with the character of a personal witness, and of one who had no other duty to perform, than that of bearing such a witness to the Christ.

Is it then upon this hypothesis, no difficulty, that

out of the four evangelists, who have all given some account of the ministry of John, *one* only makes mention of his personal testimonies to Christ? Is it no proof, on the other hand, that this duty was subordinate to his duty as an herald of the kingdom, that all four record both his preaching and his baptizing? From the time of the baptism of Christ, when only the person of the Messiah became known to John, and from which time forward, but not before it, personal attestations in favour of Christ might be delivered by him; the three first Gospels are totally silent on the subject of the ministry of John: so that had not the last Gospel, though written so long posterior to the former and expressly to supply their omissions, placed the fact of some such attestations on record, we should have remained for ever in ignorance that John had borne any personal testimony to Christ; that is, that he had ever performed the great, if not the sole business of his ministry in general. And what are these attestations, as recorded by St. John himself? They are three in number, two of them delivered on consecutive days, the third, about a month later; the former confined to the disciples of the Baptist, and the latter, as far as we can judge of it, not purposely nor primarily addressed to the rest of the people ^t.

III. If we take the Baptist's own account of his original commission ^u as implicitly to be trusted, it will follow that, though given before the commencement of his ministry, it could not be discharged until that ministry was far advanced; and when so discharged, that it would prove to be a commission to bear not a general testimony to the *future* advent, but a particular testimony to the *actual* person, of the Christ. It was given before the commencement of his ministry; for

^t John i. 29. 35. iii. 26—36.

^u i. 33.

it was given when he was first sent to baptize : it was a commission to bear witness to the person of the Messiah, because it was accompanied by a promise how that person should be recognised. It was consequently a commission which neither could be nor was intended to be executed, until this recognition had taken place ; that is, until the baptism at least of Christ ; when only the promised sign was vouchsafed. But the ministry of John had been going on some considerable time before the baptism of Christ ; for this baptism is the last thing which three of the evangelists record of his ministry at all. The ministry of John then had some proper object, distinct from the commission to bear personal testimony to Jesus Christ ; which must have been going on before the baptism of our Lord, and consequently which had been discharged from the first.

There is reason indeed to believe that even the first *general* testimony to Christ was much posterior to the commencement of the ministry of John : at least, if that instance is the occasion recorded by St. Luke ^v. And that it is so may be inferred, as I think, from the cause which produced the testimony itself : When the people were in expectation, and all men were reasoning in their own hearts concerning John, whether he might be the Christ ; John answered, saying unto all. The declaration which follows, affirming that he was not the Christ but only his predecessor, was designed to place them out of suspense : whence it seems hardly to admit of a question, that this must have been the first declaration to any such effect, which had yet taken place. It was very natural that the men of the time should at first have considered it possible that John might prove to be the Messiah, whom they had all so long been expecting : it was not less natural, or rather it was peremp-

torily incumbent upon John, that he should have disclaimed the title which they would willingly have awarded to him. But he could neither rectify this misconception of his real character until it had begun to prevail; nor yet delay to rectify it after it had. The authoritative denial therefore with which, in the present instance, he does rectify it, must on every account be considered the first of its kind; and if one such denial, and so expressed, was likely to set the mistake at rest, it would also be the last. St. Mark's account then of a similar declaration ^w will belong to the same occasion as this in St. Luke, and be only more concise; while St. Matthew's ^x, which is identically the same in terms with St. Luke's, will be this very occasion itself, joined to the account of another passage, and of a corresponding discourse, in the previous history of John.

Now that the time of this testimony was considerably later than the commencement of John's ministry I infer, first, from the reason of the thing; because the error which produced it, and was so widely spread, could not have arisen all at once. Secondly, because St. Luke has detached this single declaration from the longer discourse in St. Matthew; obviously as belonging to a later period than the rest of it. Thirdly and chiefly, because it is this testimony of the Baptist's, and as so produced, as well as so directed, to which I believe that St. Paul alluded, in the synagogue of Pisdian Antioch ^y.

Now as John was accomplishing his course, he said, Whom do ye suppose me to be? I am not He: but, lo! he is coming after me; the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to unloose.

These words of John are manifestly addressed to the people, and are as manifestly intended to rectify

^w i. 7, 8.^x iii. 11, 12.^y Acts xiii. 25.

some possible mistake, with respect to the truth of his own character. They agree therefore so far, in substance, with the declaration in St. Luke, as to imply that they must have belonged to the same occasion in the history of John; and since the former are said to have been delivered, *ὡς ἐπλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον*, the latter must have been so too; that is, they must each be supposed to have happened, when the ministry of John was far advanced; for that could on no principle be said to transpire when a man was *accomplishing* or *fulfilling* his course, which ensued when it was scarcely begun. The same conclusion results from these premises, as before; viz. that if even any *general* testimony of John's to the Messiah was not delivered, until comparatively late in the duration of his ministry, to deliver such testimony never could be the principal, much less the sole or the proper duty of his ministry from the first.

Had this actually been the case, then it was to be expected that our Lord, or his apostles, after the formal commencement of *his* ministry or of *their's*, would often be found appealing to the testimony of John; as to one of the most convincing arguments, (with all at least who admitted the divine legation of John,) which could be urged in his own behalf. But so far is this from being done, that in the first three Gospels, as soon as the Baptist is removed by his imprisonment from the public stage of his ministry; his name and memory are, from thenceforward, as good as obliterated. It is accident, humanly speaking, which causes him to be mentioned again: and as to his testimony, it is not so much as alluded to. That occasion when it might be supposed *a priori* that our Lord would have said something expressly on this subject; and when even the necessity of the case might seem to have

required it ; was the occasion of his celebrated message : for whatever, as concerned the Baptist himself, might be the motive to that message, it is indisputable that *prima facie*, and in the natural construction of the fact by those who were present, his sending such a message, and to such a person, was in some degree to retract his former declarations in behalf of Jesus Christ. Yet if our Saviour alludes at all to the *vacillation* of John, it is in figurative language ; under the form of an interrogation dismissed without an answer, and suffered to remain in a dignified silence. Once only, and that in the Gospel of St. John, is it evident that he refers directly to this subject. He who testifieth concerning me is another ; and I know that the testimony which he testifieth concerning me is true. Yourselves have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness to the truth. But I receive not my testimony from a man ; but I say these things that ye may be saved. He was the lamp which did burn and shine ; and ye were willing, for a time, to rejoice in its light. But I have that testimony which is greater than John's ; for the works, which the Father hath given me to perform, the very works which I do, testify concerning me, that the Father hath sent me^z. Even in this passage, then, it is evident that the testimony of John is appealed to solely by way of condescension, or *more humano* ; that it is not considered our Lord's proper testimony ; that he never supposed the truth of his character to depend upon it ; that in comparison of the testimony of the Father, which was manifested in the works, that is, in the miracles, performed by Christ, it was altogether secondary and inferior.

With respect therefore to the representations of pro-

^z Ch. v. 32—36.

phhecy quoted above; we may observe, first, that as far as they describe the Baptist merely under the character of a messenger or harbinger, commissioned to make known the advent of the Messiah, they describe an actual part of his office, which was strictly fulfilled in its functions. Secondly, as far as they proceed, especially the descriptions of the ancient prophets, to delineate the purposes of his mission, under images or terms derived from a well known circumstance of eastern pomp and state, the preparations usually made for a royal progress, by sending forward persons to form roads and bridges, to level mountains, to fill up valleys, to render the rough places smooth, and the crooked straight *: it is manifest that, though founded in fact themselves, they apply in figure only to the ministry of John: they predict no real change to be wrought by him in the face of external nature; but certain moral or spiritual changes in the hearts and dispositions, in the principles and practice of mankind, which should be the effect of his preaching. Now, as descriptive of such moral revolutions as these in general, they are descriptive of nothing which might not be understood of the ministration of the Messiah, as such; the business and the purpose of which, from first to last, whether by the instrumentality of John, or by the instrumentality of Christ, it was to bring these revolutions to pass.

They, who should contend that these were changes to be produced by the *sole* ministry of John, and entirely in subordination to the reception and the success

* Πέμπουσι δ' αὐτὸν, καὶ σεβίζουσιν μέγα, | κελυθοποιοὶ παῖδες Ἑφαιστου, χθόνα | ἀνήμερον τιθέντες ἡμερωμένην. Æschylus, Eumenides, 12. At vos, qua veniet, tumidi subsidite montes: | Et faciles

curvis vallibus este viæ. Ovid, Amorum ii. xvi. 51. Vide also Diodorus Sic. ii. 13, 14: Herodotus, Polymnia, passim: Jos. Bell. Jud. iii. vi. 2.

of Christ, would be reduced to this dilemma; that either they must suppose the ministry of John to have failed altogether of its effect, or they must acknowledge that our Saviour did that for himself at last, which John on this principle had done for him already before. As moral effects, all such changes must have been produced by moral causes; by the authority and influence of John, preaching the doctrine of repentance and reinforcing the duties of morality; parts of his office, in which our Lord was so far from differing from him, as not only to continue his ministry, but even to repeat the language of his preaching.

I infer then that what the Baptist had all along been doing before Christ; and what Christ continued still to do after the Baptist, being the same in each case, was done by neither for the sake of the other, but by both for the sake of something else, equally related but equally ulterior to the personal agency of each. Not but that, in whatever proportion the general wickedness of the times might be ameliorated by the preaching of John, the people would be so far the better disposed to attend to and to profit by the ministry of Christ. But this was a very different thing; conducing not to the reception of the person, but to the success of the labours of Christ; and that, not as distinct from but as the same with those of John. The efforts of both were directed to one purpose, the preparation of the minds and affections of men for the arrival of the Gospel in due time; and what effect they had each produced would not fully appear, until the Gospel began to be preached. Yet in whatever degree John might have promoted this effect, in the same degree it would be found the more forward for the labours of Christ; and by him the same work would be advanced to a still higher degree of perfection. But the

ultimate degree of all, the advancement of the work which should be due to the efforts of both, would not be fully developed before the close of the ministry of Christ; nor fully ascertained by the event, until the commencement of the ministry of the Apostles. The seed would be sown and in part matured in the time of the Messiah and of his predecessor; the fruit would not appear, nor the harvest be gathered in before the time of the successors of both. On this subject however something more will be said elsewhere.

If such had not been the original design of the ministry of John, would the prophet Isaiah have specified *this*, as the final result of that preparation which he attributes to the spiritual harbinger, that all flesh should see the *salvation* of God? For what is *the salvation* of God, but God *the Saviour*? and what is God *the Saviour*, but a *crucified Saviour*? and when was a crucified Saviour revealed or seen before the day of Pentecost, when the first Christian sermon was preached? Would the angel Gabriel have said that John should get ready for the Lord, λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον? For what is this *duly prepared*, or *befitting*, people, but the members of his future church, his *peculium* among the Jews, the ἐκλογὴ in short of Israel? Would his father Zacharias have said, that he should go before the face of the Lord to give knowledge of salvation to his people? For when was the knowledge of *salvation*, that is, the knowledge of a *Saviour*, communicated in the lifetime of John? or when were the tender mercies of God fully developed in the remission of sins, before the great forfeit had been paid in the sacrifice for sins, and human redemption was complete? Or when could the dayspring from on high be said to have shone forth on the darkness of the Gentile world, before the gospel was preached to

that world ? Or when were the feet of sinners, whether Jews or Gentiles, safely guided into the way of peace, before Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the Captain of salvation and the Prince of peace, had been distinctly proposed in all these capacities to the Jew first, and afterwards to the Gentile ?

The reasons, which are commonly assigned in explanation of the fact that the personal appearance and ministry of our Saviour were preceded by the ministry of John, though partly founded on a mistaken idea of the proper relation between them, are not less significant, but in many respects more so, when the actual truth of this relation is better apprehended. I shall not add therefore to the length of the present discussion, by either repeating those reasons, or alleging others in their stead ; but, having said thus much upon the nature, purposes, and discharge of the ministry of John in general, I shall proceed, in the last place, to adjust the details of its parts.

The period of the feast of Tabernacles, U. C. 779, A. D. 26, has been already assumed as the time when it probably began ; further than which, in ascertaining this time exactly, it may not be possible to advance. We may conjecture however that it would begin after, not before, the tenth of Tisri and the expiration of the feast itself : after the former, as being the day of the great national fast, the recurrence of which would compose the minds of men, of all at least who were likely to be duly impressed by it, to a frame of seriousness, reflection, and self-examination in accordance with the future ministry of John, who was eminently a preacher of repentance and of amendment of life : after the latter, that so the people might be returned from the feast to their homes ; and the necessity of water, for the purposes of baptism, might be pre-

viously provided for by the recurrence of the autumnal rains. The feast of Tabernacles, U. C. 779, began on September 15, and expired on September 22^a; and I have advanced a conjecture elsewhere^b that the day when John entered on his ministry, U. C. 779, was probably October 5, the assumed date of his nativity, when he completed his thirtieth year. Nor is there any thing improbable in this conjecture; but rather quite the reverse. I will observe only that October 5, U. C. 779, when the fifteenth of Tisri coincided with September 15, would coincide with Marchesvan 6. About the second or third week of Marchesvan (in this instance between October 13 and 20) the autumnal rains commonly set in; the appositeness of which coincidence to the commencement of the ministry of John I need not mention. If it began at this time, it might last, as we shall see hereafter, reckoned to the day of his imprisonment, as nearly as possible seven months; but reckoned to April 5, the day of the commencement of our Saviour's, at the Passover, John ii. 13, U. C. 780, it continued exactly six.

The scene of his ministry is laid by St. Matthew and by St. Mark, at its commencement, in the wilderness of Judæa; which does not mean an absolute desert, but a plain and champaign country, devoted to pasturage; and though comparatively remote from the more populous parts, yet not unoccupied by villages. Thus Josephus mentions Βηθαλαγὰν...κώμην οὖσαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ^c. It would be absurd indeed to suppose that John was sent to preach among solitudes, and not among the haunts of men. The principal scene of his ministry, however, as we learn from St. Luke, was the Perichorus of Jordan; the proper name of which was the

^a Vol. i. 332. Dissertation vii.

^b Vol. i. 411. Dissertation xii.

^c Ant.

Jud. xiii. i. 5. Cf. Matt. xiv. 15. Mark vi. 35, 36. Luke ix. 12.

Aulon^d; which is described by Josephus^e as two hundred and thirty stades in length, one hundred and twenty in breadth; as intersected by the Jordan, and enclosed on either side by mountains; as desert and barren, and reaching from the southern extremity of the lake of Tiberias, to the northern extremity of the lake Asphaltites*. The scene, thus chosen, seems to have been ever after the same; Bethabara or Bethany, Ænon, or Salem; all more or less contiguous places or not very remote from each other; the former in Peræa, on the eastern side of the Jordan, the latter in Galilee, on the western. The locality of Bethabara continued to be still pointed out by tradition even in the time of Origen^f; but whether correctly or not may be doubted. The preponderance of critical reasons makes rather in favour of *Bethany beyond Jordan*, than of *Bethabara*, in St. John's Gospel. Such a country was well adapted for the supply of John's peculiar food, ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον; as the desert had been previously for the materials of his dress. Clothes made of hair, in general, are alluded to by Josephus as characteristic of poverty, or of a mean estate of life†^g

The Perichorus of Jordan, for a great part of its extent, bordered upon Judæa; hence of those who

* The locality of this Perichorus appears to have been chosen as the fittest scene for the ministerial labours of John, because, when overflowed by the Jordan, and laid under water, without being too deep, it would afford the greatest facilities for baptism, or immersion.

† Apollonius, περὶ κατεψευ-
σμένης ἱστορίας, xx: Κτησίας δὲ

ἐν τῇ δεκάτῃ Περσικῶν, καμήλους
τινὰς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ γίγνεσθαι (φησιν).
ὅς ἔχειν τρίχας πρὸς Μιλήσια ἔρια
τῇ μαλακότητι· ἐκ δὲ τούτων τοὺς
ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους δυναστὰς τὰς
ἐσθῆτας φορεῖν. There was, con-
sequently, a variety of the hair
of the camel of a very different
description from this of which
John's dress was made.

^d Hieronymus, Operum ii. 393. *ad calcem*, De Situ et Nominibus. ^e Bell.
iv. viii. 2. Ant. xvi. v. 2. ^f Operum iv. 140. A—142. A. in Joann. tom. vi. 24.
^g Bell. i. xxiv. 3. Ant. xvi. vii. 3.

resorted to the baptism of John, the inhabitants of Jerusalem and of Judæa are specified among the first. It is however a circumstance of resemblance between John's ministry and of our Saviour's also, that both appear to have been almost confined to Galilee, or to the dominions of Herod Antipas; beyond the jurisdiction of the Jewish Sanhedrim. The resort to the baptism of John in question must be placed at no greater a distance of time from his first appearance, than would be necessary to make the fact of his appearance, and the nature of his preaching, generally known: and the manner in which he received the people, on what seems to be the first occasion of a mixed concourse, is recorded by St. Luke^h. I say a mixed concourse, because there were many Sadducees and Pharisees among the numberⁱ. The address, as related by St. Luke, is the same with the address as given by St. Matthew; and if the parties addressed were, as we suppose, a mixed audience, the latter might justly describe it as directed to the Pharisees or Sadducees in particular, the former, to the people in general. St. Luke's, *τί οὖν ποιήσομεν*; shews that these last considered themselves concerned in it; while St. Matthew's *γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν*—(an apostrophe contained in St. Luke also, and twice used hereafter by our Saviour, but in each instance solely of the Scribes and Pharisees—) as well as the strain of the denunciation in general; which is obviously levelled against the characteristic hypocrisy, self-righteousness, and carnal trust of the principal sects; is a much stronger intimation that some of the Pharisees, in particular, must have been present and singled out; that is, that, while all were addressed in common, these were reproved in particular.

The sequel of the same discourse, found in St. Mat-

^h Ch. iii. 7—9.

ⁱ Ibid. 7—10.

thew, as I have already observed, was not delivered at the same time with the preceding part; and yet the Evangelist might attach it to that, both as an actual, though a later discourse of the Baptist's, as well as that; and also because, as he proposed to conclude his account of the ministry of John with the next event, the baptism of Christ, this was the only opportunity, prior to that event, which he had of placing on record so important a fact as that of John's personal testimony to Christ. The subject of both the discourses is so far akin, as to admit of their being related in conjunction; and yet so far distinct, that they might be delivered at different times: nor will it be denied, on a careful consideration of them together, that there is a certain abruptness in the transition from the topic of the one to that of the other, which favours the supposition that they were not originally united. In this respect then St. Matthew and St. Mark, as we before observed, must be reduced to an harmony with St. Luke, and not St. Luke to one with St. Matthew or St. Mark: and as the commencement of John's testimonies to Christ, whether general or particular, is so far an epoch in his ministry; and as this is the only instance in the first three Gospels of any such testimony at all; it would manifestly be improbable to place it *immediately* after the beginning of his ministry, or long before the baptism of our Lord himself.

After this account, if we except only the history of the baptism of Jesus Christ, no mention of any circumstance relating to John, but that of his imprisonment and death, is to be found in the same three Gospels; and even this fact is alluded to only by the way in St. Matthew and in St. Mark, and, for reasons stated elsewhere, is anticipated by three or four months in St. Luke. From the time of this baptism, then, the sequel of the min-

istry of John is to be collected entirely from the last Gospel; and this will be done hereafter, shewing that the baptism of our Saviour, which, from the importance of the event itself and from the nature of the testimony which John was thenceforward enabled to bear to the Christ, compared with what he had been restricted to before it, was evidently qualified to become a cardinal point in the course of his ministry; actually was such; happening about the same distance of time from its commencement, as before its termination. The first public testimony after the baptism, borne to our Lord, was probably by the voice from heaven; and as he was immediately impelled into the wilderness, the first opportunity after the same event which John had of bearing witness to him, was the opportunity afforded by the deputation and the question of the sanhedrim: and his answer to this question, as far as it conveys any such testimony, is no longer general and indefinite, speaking of some one merely as to come, but particular and definite, so far as to speak of some one who was already standing in the midst of them, and was already known to the Baptist, though still unknown to them. This then is that instance of his testimony, to which, as understood to be given to himself, though without any mention of himself, our Saviour referred above^k.

The obligation to perpetual Nazaritism, from his mother's womb, which might have been daily endangered had John been brought up amidst the usual society of men^l, seems to be the true reason why he was educated and lived in the desert, until the day of his shewing to Israel. Not but that the existence of eremites, even in his time, might be no uncommon thing^m. For the same reason he would be excused

^k John v. 33.^l Numb. vi. 2—21.^m Vita Josephi, 2.

from attendance at the feasts. Hence if our Saviour's life also, until the same period, was spent in a similar privacy at Nazarethⁿ, it would seem impossible to doubt that John asserted a matter of fact, when he asserted that he knew not the Christ^o; even though the assertion be restricted to the *person* of Christ; before at least his baptism: and if it is implied by St. Matthew's account of what passed between them at the time of his baptism^p, that he must have known him *then*, we have only to suppose that the knowledge in question was communicated to him on the appearance of Christ, as the knowledge of Saul, and afterwards of David, was communicated to Samuel^q, and the knowledge of the wife of Jeroboam was imparted to Ahijah^r, by a direct inspiration from above: and both facts become consistent. For as to the recognition implied by the descent of the Holy Ghost, and consequently not until the baptism was over, however much commentators may have overlooked this truth, nothing is clearer than that that descent was intended to mark out not the person, but the office of Christ. I, indeed, knew him not, but he who sent me to baptize in water, the same said to me, On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon him, this is he who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. The object of such a recognition then was to ascertain our Lord, as him who should baptize in the Holy Ghost; in opposition to John who had merely baptized in water. It had nothing to do with the person of Christ. It opposed the Spirit-baptism of the Messiah to the water-baptism of his predecessor; and it was consistent with the knowledge of the person of the Messiah, whether

ⁿ Matt. xiii. 55. Mark vi. 3. John vi. 42. Justin Martyr, Dialogus, 333.
^l 1—8. ^o John i. 33. ^p Ch. iii. 14. ^q 1 Sam. ix. 16, 17. xvi. 12.
^r 1 Kings xiv. 6.

as previously possessed, or as now for the first time revealed *.

The conduct of the Baptist, therefore, when he would have declined the administration of his own baptism on our Lord, was founded in a genuine humility, and a sincere conviction of the superior dignity of Christ, such as this knowledge of his person either conveyed or implied ; and our Lord's answer, by which he impressed on him the necessity of performing his part in that ceremony, rightly understood, instructs us in the final end of his baptism itself : with the consideration of which I shall conclude this Dissertation on the ministry of John.

The answer was doubtless emphatic ; that is, was specially in reference to the time then present, and to some obligation incumbent, at that time, both on John and on our Lord himself in particular. Our Lord would not have said, Suffer it to be so *now*, could it have been as well suffered at any other time, before or after it, as at that ; nor, For thus it behoveth *us* to fulfil all righteousness, had the same fulfilment, in that one respect, been equally incumbent on others, as on them in particular. I infer therefore that the obligation in question was to no moral duty, binding upon moral agents in general ; but to some legal requisition, incumbent on these two more especially : the nature of which we must needs collect from the instance of its observance, which was our Lord's receiving from John, and John's administering on our Lord, one and the same rite of baptism ; but each, as part of a further and a much more important ceremonial, the consecration of our Lord to his ministerial office, preparatory to his entering upon it.

* Theophylact, Operum i. 525.
D. in Joh. i. ἡ καὶ ἄλλως ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν,
ὅτι ᾗδαι μὲν αὐτὸν ὅτι Χριστός ἐστιν,

ὅτι δέ γε αὐτὸς ὁ βαπτίσων ἐστὶν ἐν
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, τότε ἔμαθεν, ὅτε τὸ
πνεῦμα ἰδε καταβαῖνον.

That the Levitical high-priest was always a type of the Christian may be taken for granted; and that John, as the son of Zacharias and of Elizabeth, was competent to sustain even the character of the Levitical high-priest is not less obvious. That there existed also under the Law an high-priest, and one only not the high-priest, but in other respects superior in dignity, and in the sacredness of his character, to all besides, is proved by various authorities. *Kἀν ἄρα τίς πον, οὐ λέγω τῶν ἄλλων Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἱερέων, οὐχὶ τῶν ὑστάτων, ἀλλὰ τῶν τὴν εὐθὺς μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον τάξιν εἰληχότων, κ', τ. λ.^s.* Constituebatur autem sacerdos, qui dignitate proximus esset a summo sacerdote, sic tanquam in administratione regni est secundus a rege. is vicarius appellabatur, idem etiam dicebatur antistes. is igitur ad dextram summi sacerdotis semper adstabat^t, &c. And even this vicar had two subvicars^u. Vide also the passages quoted in the margin^v.

In this relation may the Levitical high-priest be considered to have stood to the Christian in general; and certainly John, the representative of the Levitical high-priesthood, the forerunner of the Messiah, the paronymph of the spiritual bridegroom, and the greatest prophet among all who had been born of women, to our Saviour in particular. Now the consecration of the Levitical high-priest was a necessary ceremony before he could enter on his ministry: much more then the consecration of the Christian. But if our Saviour was not consecrated upon the occasion of his baptism, it would not be easy to say when he was. I regard his baptism therefore as the ceremony of his consecration. And that a priest as such could be consecrated only by a priest; and the

^s Philo, ii. 59. l. 10—14. De Virtutibus. ^t Maimonides, De Apparatu Templi, iv. 16. ^u Ibid. 17. ^v 2 Sam. viii. 17. xx. 25. 2 Kings xxv. 18. Jos. Ant. Jud. viii. i. 4. x. viii. 5. xviii. iv. 3. xviii. i. 1. compared with xvii. xiii. i. Vita, 38. Bell. ii. xii. 6. iv. iii. 9.

high-priest himself so properly by none, as by the next in dignity to himself; nor consequently our Saviour so properly by any as by John; appears too obvious to require any proof. The true consecration of Jesus Christ might be the effusion of the Holy Ghost; but his previous baptism, as the event proved, was necessary even to that.

We may look upon his baptism, therefore, with all its circumstances and its effects, to have constituted his true and his proper consecration; such as was naturally to be expected in the spiritual antitype of the legal prototype. Nor is there any particular, requisite to the integrity of the legal form^w, which may not be seen, *mutatis mutandis*, to have held good in what now took place. The previous ablution of the body of the priest was supplied by the baptism itself; and the agency, which performed that part of the ceremony, was a competent agency; for it was the agency of John. The absence of the sacred chrism^x was compensated by the presence of its antitype, the gifts and graces of the spiritual unction^y; and the medium by which these were effused was the medium of the Holy Ghost. The robes of beauty and of holiness, which adorned the person of the priest^z, were the essential innocence and the spotless purity of the nature of Christ; a much more glorious garb, and a much more becoming one for the Christian high-priest, than the Aaronical vesture; besides being always typified by that^a. More than this I do not know to have been requisite to the inauguration even of the legal high-priest; and if the baptism of our Lord answered to all this, the baptism of our Lord, regarded as his inauguration also, was complete.

^w Exod. xxix. 1—7. xl. 12—15. Lev. viii. 5, &c. ^x Exod. xxx. 22—33.
^y Ps. xlv. 7. ^z Exod. xxviii. 2. ^a Ps. xlv. 8.

DISSERTATION XX.

On the order of the temptations.

THE order of the temptations is not the same throughout in each of the Evangelists ; that is, the second temptation in St. Matthew is the third in St. Luke, and the second in St. Luke is the third in St. Matthew. The order of St. Matthew too appears, from the notes of sequence which he employs, to be the real ; nor does the arrangement in St. Luke, who nowhere affirms his order, militate against this conclusion. And hence it has been inferred, that St. Luke did not write after a strict historical method.

But if this inference proceeds on the supposition that the several temptations, though individually distinct, are still the particulars of one transaction, it is manifestly illogical ; for notwithstanding any difference in the disposal of the parts, the whole is related in its place : and if it does not proceed on that supposition, but regards the several temptations as so many detached and independent events, it proceeds upon a false hypothesis ; that is, on a mistaken idea of the temptations themselves.

I am ready to admit that the order of St. Matthew's narrative, in this instance, may be the actual order of the event ; yet it does not follow on that account that St. Luke's contains a Trajection. The moral end proposed by the narrative in either, though it must have been partly the same, might be partly so far distinct also, as to require St. Matthew to observe the actual order of the event, and to excuse St. Luke for making a corresponding change in it.

The temptation, regarded in any point of view, was

unquestionably one of the most mysterious transactions in our Saviour's personal history; and without pretending to unravel the mystery, or to be wise beyond what is written, I am content to profess my belief in the reality of the transaction itself; and in the reality of the parties concerned in it; of that being, who is called the Tempter, the Devil, or Satan, as much as of our Lord himself, whose personal existence no one will think of disputing. For the sake however of the argument above alluded to, which concerns in some degree the first principles of the present Harmony, I shall lay before the reader, as concisely as possible, what I consider the most general outline of the nature of the Temptation, and the purposes to which it was directed.

I. Not one of the temptations is to be contemplated as what it is *in specie*, but as what it is *in genere*; that is, each of them *familiam ducit*, and is the representative of a class. St. Luke himself has intimated this truth, when he observes at the end of the account, iv. 13, συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος—not, πάντα ΤΟΝ πειρασμόν: every kind of temptation, not, *the* whole temptation*.

II. The first temptation, according to the order of St. Matthew, is addressed to a natural appetite; and consequently it is a specimen of such temptations as may be addressed to the purely sensual principle. The second is addressed to the ostentatious display of superior worth, goodness, or estimation in the sight of God; that is, to the principle of pride; and consequently it is a specimen of temptations directed against the purely intellectual

* Theophylact, i. 21. B. in Matt. iv: ὅθεν ὁ Λουκᾶς φησιν ὅτι πάντα πειρασμὸν ἐτέλεσε, τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν πειρασμῶν τετέλεσας. Ibid. 298. E. in Luc. iv: πάντα πειρασμὸν φησιν ὁ Λουκᾶς συντελέσαι τὸν

Κύριον, καίτοι τρεῖς πειρασμοὺς πειρασθέντα, διότι κεφάλαια τῶν πειρασμῶν πάντων οἱ τρεῖς οὗτοί εἰσιν, ὁ τῆς φιλοχρηματίας, ὁ τῆς γαστριμαργίας, ὁ τῆς φιλοδοξίας.

principle. The third is addressed to the love of honour, wealth, or power; and therefore is a specimen of temptations addressed to a mixed principle; or to a principle partly intellectual and partly moral.

III. The order of the temptations is the order of their strength; that is, they begin with the weakest and proceed to the strongest; for any other order would manifestly be preposterous: and the end of the whole transaction is to represent our Lord as tempted in all points like unto ourselves, yet without sin; as attacked in each vulnerable part of human nature, yet superior to every artifice, and to all the subtlety of the Devil.

IV. The proximate cause of the first temptation was our Lord's being an hungred at the time: the proximate cause of the second, as we may reasonably conjecture, was the voice from heaven at his baptism: and the proximate cause of the third, as it is equally reasonable to conclude, was the expectation of a temporal Messiah.

V. The immediate purpose of each temptation is purely tentative: but the object of the two first is to discover whether Christ was the Son of God; the object of the last is to discover whether he was the true, or a false Christ. If so, the last temptation in St. Matthew, besides being actually the last in the order of succession, would appear the strongest in the eyes of a Jew; because it was directly a temptation that our Saviour should avow himself to be the Messiah, whom the Jews expected. For, that to fall down and worship Satan, in the hope of worldly pomp and grandeur, was to renounce the character of the true Christ, and to assume the character of the false, is too obvious to require any proof. If St. Matthew then wrote for the Jews, his account of this temptation, besides being

more agreeable to the order of the event, would make it appear the strongest also: for the last temptation was one, which the true Christ only could withstand, and which the false Christs, who came successively after the true, never were able to withstand.

VI. This presumption however in favour of the last temptation is ultimately reducible to the national prejudice in behalf of a temporal Messiah; and consequently was confined to the Jews. The Gentiles, who partook in no such prejudice, could not be prepared (on those grounds at least) to appreciate its force accordingly. To them it would appear in the light of a temptation simply addressed to the desire of honour, wealth, or power; and therefore one of inferior strength to the second. For the history of their own philosophers could furnish instances of persons, whom their natural strength had enabled to surmount the last of these temptations; but few or none of such as, unassisted by the grace of God, had not fallen victims to the second. Hence, if St. Luke wrote for Gentile Christians, as St. Matthew had written for Jewish, he would as naturally place the second temptation last, as St. Matthew, on the other supposition, had placed the third.

VII. This view of the principle of St. Luke's arrangement is further confirmed by that classification of impure desires, which is given by St. John; and as it seems, in reference to this account of our Lord's temptation itself: ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ ἡ ἀλάζονεῖα τοῦ βίου^a. The desire of the flesh is a description of temptations of the first class; the desire of the eyes, (which are captivated by external pomp and splendour,) of temptations like the second; and the pride of life, or as it should rather be rendered, the *vain-glory* of life, of temptations like the

^a 1 Ep. ii. 16.

third ; and of each as they stand in St. Luke. This sense of ἀλαζονεία is determined by classical usage. It is specified by Aristotle^b as the extreme of excess opposed to the mean habit, which he denominates ἀλήθεια, the nature of which being to make its possessor habitually appear what he is, and neither better nor worse, as compared with others, than the truth of his character will warrant ; the vice of excess, opposed to it, is that which makes him habitually studious of appearing other than he is, in a sense beyond and not below the truth. In a word, it is the habit of arrogance, boastfulness, ostentation ; without the foundation of superior excellence or real desert of any kind : a description of failing to which the professors of philosophy anciently, and especially in our Saviour's time, were notoriously liable*.

* Scriptorum Deperditorum Vaticana Coll. ii. 220. l. 26. Excerpta e Dione, cii: Μουκιανὸς πρὸς Βεσπασιανὸν κατὰ τῶν Στωϊκῶν πλείστα τέ εἶπε, καὶ θαυμάσια· ὥς ὅτι αὐχήματος κενοῦ εἰσι πεπληρωμένοι, κἂν τὸν πῶγωνά τις αὐτῶν καθῇ, καὶ τὰς ὀφρύας ἀνασπᾷ, τό τε τριβώνιον ἀναβάλλεται, καὶ ἀνυπόδητος βαδίσῃ, σοφὸς εὐθύς, ἀνδρείος, δίκαιός φησιν εἶναι, καὶ πνεῖ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μέγα, κἂν τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο μήτε γράμ-

ματα μήτε νεῖν ἐπίσταται· καὶ πάντας ὑπερορῶσι, καὶ τὸν μὲν εὐγενῆ τιθαλλῶδον^c, τὸν δὲ ἀγενῆ σμικρόφρονα, καὶ τὸν μὲν καλὸν ἀσελγῇ, τὸν δὲ αἰσχρὸν εὐφυνᾷ, τὸν δὲ πλούσιον πλεονέκτην, τὸν δὲ πένητα δουλοπρεπῇ, καλοῦσι. A good illustration of that ἀλαζονεία of the philosophers of this time, especially of the Cynics and Stoics, alluded to above.

^b Ethica Nic. iv. 7. Cf. Demetrius Phalereus, De Elocutione, caput 119. and Suidas, Ἀλαζονεία and Ἀλάζων. ^c De hac voce, videndus Pollux, Onomasticon, iii. cap. ii. §. 3. He writes it τηθαλλαδούν, and explains it, ὁ ὑπὸ τήθης τραφεῖς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὢν ὑγρότερος καὶ μαμμόθρεπτος : “ a spoiled child :” Cf. Hesychius in voce, and Eustathius in Iliad. ξ' 114. Suidas also has τηθαλλαδούς : that is, γυναικοτρόφους, ὑπὸ τήθῃ τεθραμμένους. The Etymologicon writes it τηθαλλωδούς.

DISSERTATION XXI.

On the hiatus in the first three Gospels between the time of the baptism of our Saviour, and the commencement of his ministry in Galilee; and on its supplement by the Gospel of St. John.

THE assertion, that the Gospel of St. John is supplementary to the rest, requires it to be proved that, in all those instances in which the former narratives are evidently not continuous, the narrative of St. John comes in critically to connect them, and to fill them up: and as this proof is capable of an high degree of precision, I propose to establish it at present in the first, and not the least complete and satisfactory example of the kind; with regard to the substance of the sections included between the first and the fourth chapters of St. John.

The former Gospels, after beginning their accounts with the public ministry of John the Baptist, and bringing them down to the time of the baptism of Jesus, are altogether silent, if we except the single fact of the fasting and the temptation, upon any intermediate events between the time of the baptism, and the date of that return to Galilee, with which they all concur in representing our Lord's ministry there to have been begun. Unless then it can be demonstrated that this return followed immediately on the fasting and temptation, as the fasting and temptation probably followed on the baptism; there is necessarily some hiatus in the continuity of their accounts; the measure of which is the interval between the close of the forty days' fast, and the time of the return into Galilee: an hiatus which will, consequently, be greater or less as

this interval is greater or less ; but will be nothing at all solely on the supposition that this interval is so too ; or that the return into Galilee took place, without loss of time, after the forty days' fast. But that this last supposition is not the case may be proved by the testimony of St. John's Gospel, as follows.

The strictly historical part of this Gospel does not begin nor proceed except with the nineteenth verse of chapter the first : the verses before that are the substance of reflections, premised by the evangelist in his own person ; which serve as an introduction or proœm to the whole work, but are no portion of its historical matter. It cannot be considered to begin even at the fifteenth verse ; first, because the words there recited, as the words of some testimony of John, are clearly an Anticipation, and clearly referred to as such ; an Anticipation, which the course of the narrative, but only from verse nineteenth and thenceforwards, goes on to explain and to apply : for that peculiar declaration, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγρονε, was first made by John in his answer to the sanhedrim ; and the first personal application of it to our Lord took place on the following day. Secondly, because the reference to the Baptist is plainly to be restricted to that one verse ; and what follows from thence to the eighteenth, is subjoined by the evangelist himself, in the same spirit and to the same effect with the preceding part of the chapter, from the first verse to the fourteenth. The mention of John then here is no more historical than the same mention in verses six, seven, eight before ; all which relate indeed to him, but evidently in a general and proleptical sense.

Now at the nineteenth verse of chapter the first, we have the account of a fact which could not be prior, at the earliest, to the baptism of Jesus ; nor consequently

to the beginning of the forty days' fast; but must have been some time, either more or less, posterior to both. And we may go further than this: the fact in question, we may contend, was not only by some time, either more or less, posterior to the baptism and to the beginning of the forty days' fast; but cannot, on any principle, be placed earlier than on the very last day of the forty days' fast itself. For, on the day after this fact, John, says the evangelist^a, saw Jesus walking towards him; and from the testimony which he immediately bears to him, it is clear that Jesus had been already baptized; for John had seen the Holy Ghost descending and abiding upon him. This appearance then of Jesus to John was necessarily posterior to the baptism; and if it cannot be shewn to have happened between the baptism and the temptation, it must have been posterior also to the temptation.

Now the testimony of each of the evangelists, who record the temptation, is express to the point that Jesus was led or impelled by the Spirit, without any perceptible delay, from the scene of his baptism to the scene of his fasting and temptation; and the testimony of St. John, who alone records this appearance, is not less express to the point that in two days after it^b, Jesus was proposing to return into Galilee; and in five days after it^b, he was actually in Cana of Galilee. It would be the height of extravagance to suppose that all this could have happened between the time of the baptism, and the beginning of the forty days' fast; which being the case, the appearance of Jesus to John, and consequently the deputation from the sanhedrim to interrogate John, which had its conference with him on the day before, each of them being later than the baptism were each of them later than the fast; or

^a Ch. i. 29.^b Ch. i. 29. 35. 44. ii. 1.

could not have happened at the earliest the former before the day after, and the latter before the very day of Jesus' return from the wilderness, when the forty days' fast was over.

After the account of this fact, and of one return into Galilee subsequent to it, there is an account of a Passover, attended by Jesus at Jerusalem^c; and after this Passover of a residence, longer or shorter, in the land of Judæa^c; and after this residence of another return into Galilee; prior to none of which events, except perhaps the last, and that only after our Lord was departed from Samaria, is it capable of proof that John had been cast into prison. It is evident then upon the whole, that between John i. 19, and iv. 1, that is, between the proper historical commencement of the Gospel of St. John, and the beginning of the account of this journey through Samaria into Galilee, we have a narrative of matters intermediate to the two extremes of the baptism, fasting, and temptation, (where the former evangelists suspended their accounts,) on the one hand, and of the imprisonment of the Baptist, followed by the return of Jesus into Galilee, (at which they resumed them,) on the other. It follows therefore that whatever be the length of time included between these two points in the Gospel of St. John; for that length of time, whether greater or less, there is an interruption of the continuity of the other Gospels; which interruption this portion of St. John's does manifestly contribute to supply. The question then which we have still to consider is, how far it contributes to supply it? or whether the historical matter furnished by St. John is an exact measure of the historical matter omitted by the rest? and the affirmative of this question will be sufficiently proved if it can be shewn that

St. John begins where they broke off, and leaves off where they began again ; and gives a connected detail of particulars between. To examine therefore each of these points in their order ; and first of the two extremes.

The second journey into Galilee, recorded by St. John, is either the same, or not the same with that return, recorded by the other evangelists, which they make to precede the beginning of our Lord's ministry there. If it is the same, one part of our assertion is established ; for from that time forward, St. John suspends and they continue the course of the subsequent history, down to the arrival of the second Passover. If it is not the same, then this second journey *into* Galilee must have been followed by a second journey *out* of it ; and this second journey *out* of it, by a third journey *into* it, at least ; the two former prior to the imprisonment of John, but posterior to Jesus' residence in Judæa previously specified ; (of none of which things is there the least hint in the Gospel history ;) and the last only coincident with that return into Galilee, posterior to the imprisonment of John, which was the beginning of our Lord's ministry there. The improbability of this hypothesis is too great to require its refutation ; and though it were true, yet instead of diminishing it would only enlarge the hiatus in the former accounts ; nor do I know of any harmonist who maintains it. The second journey of St. John then into Galilee, may be implicitly considered the last journey, at least into Galilee, from any other quarter, before the formal commencement of our Saviour's ministry there ; in which case, the coincidence between his Gospel, and the Gospels of the other three evangelists, at one of the extreme points in particular, becomes indisputable ; and the fact of this coincidence at one and

the second extreme, being made out, may justly be urged as a presumptive argument for the same kind of coincidence at the other and the first.

It has been already shewn that the earliest historical fact, recorded by St. John, is one of the most memorable, and yet probably one of the latest events in the ministry of the Baptist; his solemn reply to the solemn interrogation of the Jewish sanhedrim. It has been shewn, also, that the time of this event could not precede the forty days' fasting and the temptation; though it might coincide with the expiration of the latter. It may be said however that, provided it followed some time, it might have followed *any* time after them; and consequently that it cannot be concluded with certainty, how far the account of this event in St. John joins on directly to the account of the fast and of the temptation in the rest of the evangelists: which I am ready to admit. But it may be rendered presumptively certain that there could be no great interval of time between them; and it has been shewn that there might be none. The one might have happened on the very day when the other was over.

Jesus came to Bethabara, or wherever else it was that John was baptizing, *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*, on purpose to be baptized; and as soon as that was done, he was led away at once to the wilderness, to undergo his fasting, succeeded by his temptation. Whatever be supposed the locality of this wilderness, the appointed scene of each of these events; it must have been some wilderness, to arrive at which would carry him either to the east, or to the south of Bethabara; and consequently away from Galilee, not towards it. The Talmudic writers acknowledge no more than two deserts as such, one of which would be the scene of the fasting and the temptation; the desert of Judah,

which lay to the south, and the desert of Sihon and Og, which lay to the east of Galilee^d. There was no desert to the north, except the great desert of Syria; into which it would be absurd to suppose our Saviour was carried.

Hence, in order to return from this wilderness, even upon his way to Galilee, he would probably have to come back to Bethabara; or to travel in that direction in general, by which he had before proceeded from it. The other evangelists, having brought him from Galilee to Bethabara, before the baptism and temptation, either leave him afterwards still in Bethabara, or at least do not make him return into Galilee all at once: for according to them, even after the baptism and temptation, when John was still at large, there must have been some time during which Jesus was absent from Galilee, or he would not be supposed to return thither first after John's imprisonment only. The narrative of St. John in particular, as it certainly takes up their's, posterior to the baptism and temptation in general; so manifestly finds our Saviour either still at Bethabara, or but recently returned unto it. If then he had quitted that neighbourhood, before the point of time where *their* accounts expired, he must yet have come thither again, at or before the point of time when *St. John's* account begins. The probability indeed is that he was only just returned, when the testimony, recorded John i. 29, was delivered by John; and that this was the first opportunity, since the baptism of Jesus, which John had of delivering any such testimony at all. On the second day after this time, Jesus himself was preparing to return into Galilee; and in three days after, he was actually in Cana of Galilee: and as he came from Nazareth, the place of his pre-

^d Reland, Palæstina, i. lvi. 376. Vide also 1 Macc. v. 24. Ant. Jud. xii. viii. 3.

vious residence, in order to be baptized, so to arrive at Cana upon his return, he must pass through or by Nazareth again. Nor did he come to Bethabara, as the course of events subsequently proves, to commence his ministry, but to be baptized; and perhaps to undergo the spiritual trial and probation, consequent upon his baptism, as a preparation for it. These ends being accomplished, he would naturally return into Galilee; and would continue there, until the time should arrive when it would be necessary for him to appear in Judæa; where he designed first to commence his ministry. The very purpose of a two days' residence at Bethabara, as it was, might be the express desire of affording John the necessary opportunity of reinforcing his former *general*, by a renewed *particular* testimony to himself; such as is afterwards referred to, John iii. 26. 28, by the followers of the Baptist; and perhaps for the sake of some of the chief of our Lord's future disciples, the foundation of whose faith in Jesus seems now to have been laid.

We may consider it therefore sufficiently probable that the point, where St. John's Gospel begins, is, on the whole, directly contiguous to the point where the other Gospels break off; and consequently that the coincidence between them, at the first of the extremes, is as critical and complete as that at the second: in which case, the remaining question, or what concerns the intermediate detail of particulars, admits of so easy a decision, that we may be satisfied with referring to the bare inspection of the narrative; and proceed to the consideration of another, which is a much more difficult, as well as more important question; What is the precise interval of time, comprehended by these details, from the one of the above extremes to the other?

The notes of time, interspersed in the body of the narrative, for the period in question, being collected together and stated in their order, stand as follows :

I. The intervening Passover, John ii. 13, being regarded as a fixed point, up to which we must trace the series of particulars before, and from which we are to deduce them afterwards ; first, from the time of the conference with the sanhedrim, to the time when our Lord was preparing to return into Galilee, there was one day.

II. From the time when he was preparing to return into Galilee, to the beginning of the wedding feast at Cana, there were three days.

III. From the beginning of that feast, according to the usage of the Jews^e, to its conclusion, there might be as many as seven days ; but there could not well be more.

IV. After the feast at Cana, the time taken up by the residence of our Lord in Capernaum, which St. John states at *not many days*, may be estimated at seven successive days.

These calculations being laid together, the whole interval between the time of the conference with the sanhedrim, and the time of the departure from Capernaum to attend the Passover, John ii. 13, will amount to eighteen days. From Capernaum to Jerusalem would be a journey of not more at the utmost than three days' time^f; and we may assume that our Lord would arrive in Jerusalem neither after the fourteenth of Nisan, the day of the Passover itself, nor probably much before the tenth, the day when the Paschal Lamb was appointed originally to be taken up—and the day on which we have conjectured that he himself

^e Gen. xxix. 27. Judges xiv. 12. Tobit xi. 19. viii. 19. Reland, Palæstina, i. li. 331.

^f Jos. Vita, 52.

was born—and the day when, as it will be shewn hereafter, he presented himself in the temple of God, before the fourteenth of Nisan in the last year of his ministry, as the true Paschal Lamb—then ready to be offered up. The entire interval, then, between the time of the conference with the sanhedrim, and the arrival in Jerusalem, by the tenth of Nisan, before the first Passover, may be computed at twenty-one days; and that probably rather above than under the truth. To this we must add the forty days' fast, subsequent to the baptism, and before the temptation; the time taken up by the temptation itself; and the time taken up in travelling first from Bethabara to the scene of the temptation, and secondly from the same scene to Bethabara back again: and we shall obtain the whole measure of time between the baptism, and the arrival in Jerusalem, John ii. 13. On none of these points can there be much uncertainty. The temptation must have been transacted in less than one day after the close of the fast, if not on the last day of the fast itself: and though the scene of the fast had been the great wilderness to the south and south-east of Judæa, as I should be disposed to believe it was; even this would not be more than one or two days' journey from Bethabara. Beersheba, on the verge of that desert, was only twenty Roman miles distant from Hebron^g. Tekoah, only six miles from Bethlehem, stood upon its borders also. Ultra, says Jerome^h, nullus est viculus, ne agrestes quidem casæ et furnorum similes, quas Afri appellant mapalia. tanta est eremi vastitas, quæ usque ad mare Rubrum, Persarumque et Æthiopum atque Indorum terminos dilatatur. Maimonides confirms Jerome, by making the distance of the wilder-

^g Eusebius et Hieronymus, Operum ii. Pars i^a. 415. *ad med.* De Situ et Nominibus.

^h Operum iii. 1369, 1370. Præfatio in Amos.

ness, into which it was usual to carry the escape goat on the day of expiation, only twelve miles from Jerusalemⁱ. Peræa, in which Bethabara was situated, approached still nearer to that wilderness. Strabo^k reckons it only three or four days' journey from Jericho to Petra in Arabia deserta. And this is confirmed by Diodorus Siculus, xix. 95, who mentions an instance of a march performed in three days and nights, from the parts about Gaza to Petra; a distance of 1200 stades, or 150 Roman miles: at the rate of 25 such miles to the *day**. The

* In the printed text of Diodorus, the number of stadia is stated at 2200; which, if accomplished in *three days and three nights*, would be at the rate of 733 stadia to a *day* and a *night*; and this, we may venture to say, would be a physical impossibility. There is, consequently, *prima facie*, some error in the statement; and either the measure of the stadium, as followed here, was different from the usual one; (fifteen or sixteen to the Roman mile, instead of eight;) or the true length of time taken up by the march was *six* days and as many nights.

It confirms this conclusion, that Diodorus himself¹ mentions another instance, when a march of 2500 stadia was performed, but by extraordinary exertions of speed only, in *seven* days and *seven* nights; at the rate of 357 stadia in twenty-four hours, not more. Nor would it be easy to cite examples, in which a distance beyond this maximum of three

or four hundred stadia, may be seen to have been accomplished by an army in less than a day and a night.

Alexander the Great was as remarkable for the expedition of his motions as any ancient commander; yet he seldom appears to have exceeded this^m. Josephus mentions an instance wherein *ten schæni*, that is, three hundred stadia, were traversed apparently in *one* nightⁿ; but, as the context proves; especially in comparison with scripture; really in part of a day, as well as a night.

Isocrates, Panegyricus §. 98, 1200 stades is the precise distance supposed to be travelled by the Spartans, in three days, and as many nights, in order to join the Athenians before the battle of Marathon: (compare Herodotus, vi. 106. 120:) which would be at the rate of four hundred stades in a day and a night. The *justum iter diurnum* for a Roman army was sixteen miles;

ⁱ De Solemni die Expiationum, iii. 7. Annot.

^k xvi. 4. §. 21. 442.

¹ xviii. 44. Cf. Appian, de rebus Hispaniensibus, vi. 58. 94: Plutarch, Philopæmon, 18. Tacitus, Ann. xv. 16. Hist. iii. 21. Frontini Strategematum iii. 11. §. 4.

^m Arriani Expositio Alex. vi. 6. Plutarch, Alexander, 42. Ælian, Variæ Hist. x. 4. Alexandri Itinerarium, 73.

ⁿ Ant. Jud. vi. v. 3.

same passage informs us that Petra was situated in the wilderness, two days' journey distant from the inhabited country: in which case, from the banks of the Jordan, near Jericho, into the desert could be merely one day's journey. Jerome^o also makes it a three days' journey from Gerara (which he places contiguous to Beersheba, and consequently on the verge of the same desert in general) to Jerusalem. I am persuaded therefore that one day's journey, if it were necessary to insist upon this circumstance, must have sufficed to bring our Saviour to the borders of the scene of his fasting and temptation, if that was the wilderness of Arabia; and one day's journey to bring him back from the locality of the last temptation, again*; and that a period of forty-one days

a forced march might be twice as much, or more.

To travel 750 stades at a time is reckoned by Dio, lxxvii. 11. a great thing even for a person on horseback: and Strabo, xv. 2. §. 6. 169, 170, does indeed mention that Alexander in his return from India, over the desert, sometimes travelled 600 stades at a time. But this was in passing from one watering place to another, and by marching in the night, as well as the day time.

Athenæus, who made the march in question, set out from the vicinity of Gaza; from whence to Petra in Arabia the distance could not possibly be greater than from Gaza to Elan on the *Sinus Arabicus*: yet this distance the ancient geographers reckon only 1260 stadia (Strabo xvi. 2. §. 30. 349: Pliny, H. N. v. 12: Marcion Heracle-

ota, Periplus, Lib. i. apud Geographos Minores, 9, 10) a computation which the best modern maps shew to be near the truth. The rate of his march then was 400 stades in a day and a night, or 1200 stades in all. And this is further confirmed by the fact that when he retreated from Petra, which was sometime between midnight and morning, his day's march, as such, next ensuing, was exactly half this amount, or 200 stades; which under ordinary circumstances was the rate of a day's march: see Plutarch, Artaxerxes, 24. Antonius, 47.

* In reference to this subject, it is to be observed, that our Lord would return to Bethabara, or wherever John was baptizing, after the temptation, from that particular locality which was the scene of the last temptation. Now this, accord-

^o Operum ii. Pars ia. 525. *ad calcem*. 526. *ad prin.* Liber Quæstionum Hebraic. in Genesim.

might account for the transaction of every thing between these extremes.

The whole interval of time then between the baptism of Jesus Christ, and the arrival in Jerusalem at the first Passover, may probably be computed at sixty-four or sixty-five days; that is, at something more than two months in all: a computation critically in unison with the testimony of St. Luke to the age of our Lord at his baptism, on the supposition that he was born about the Passover; which testimony we concluded to mean that he was less than three, but more than two months under the full age of thirty^m. And it is manifest that a more liberal allowance of time, should any part of the period in question be considered to require it, which would still make the whole less than ninety, though greater than sixty days, would square with the same testimony. The *Chronicon Paschale* supposes it an interval of seventy-six days in allⁿ; and that may be about the truth.

Again; the calculations belonging to the next half of the detail, deduced from the Passover downwards, will stand as follows:

I. The time of the stay in Jerusalem, which cannot be stated at longer than the duration of the Paschal feast^o, may be computed from the tenth of Nisan to the twenty-second.

ing to St. Matthew, was the *high mountain*. The name of this mountain is of course unknown. Yet we may conjecture it was probably some neighbouring mountain, as Tabor, where our Lord was transfigured, or Nebo, on which Moses had the view of the promised

land revealed to him. Either of these was within a moderate distance of Bethabara. As to mount Quarantaria—it has no claim but that of tradition, to be considered the scene of the third temptation. Yet even Quarantaria would not be too far off.

^m Vol. i. 369. Diss. xi.

ⁿ i. 408. l. 16.

^o John ii. 13. iii. 22.

II. The time of some residence in Judæa, posterior to the departure from Jerusalem^p; neither the place nor the duration of which is specified. With regard to the one, then, we can conjecture with certainty only that it was some quarter of Judæa bordering on Samaria, and in the vicinity of water; the former, because our Lord is seen to travel thence direct to Sychar, the latter, because converts were made and baptized there by his disciples: and with regard to the other, it must be determined on independent grounds; and for the present may be left indefinite.

III. After the expiration of this residence, when Jesus set out for Galilee^q, there is the length of his journey to Sychar, and the time of his continuance there, to be taken into account; the former of which I estimate at one day's journey and part of a second at the utmost; and the latter is determined by the evangelist himself as of two days' length; the first of which might be the day of the arrival itself. It is well known that Sychar lay upon the high road between Jerusalem and Galilee; and its distance from the former is computed, in the Jerusalem Itinerary, at forty Roman miles. But our Saviour was not at Jerusalem before he set out for Sychar; and he might be somewhere in Judæa much nearer to it than Jerusalem itself. Sebaste, according to Josephus^r; (though his statement must probably be understood with some latitude, and perhaps was meant of the frontiers of Judæa, not of Jerusalem;) was one day's journey from Jerusalem; and Sychar was seven or eight miles nearer to the latter than Sebaste. I assume then that our Saviour had made one day's journey complete, before he arrived at Sychar. On the third day after his arrival, he would continue his journey into Galilee. A single day's

^p Ch. iii. 22.^q John iv. 1—3.^r Ant. Jud. xv. viii. 5.

journey, or at the utmost two, would suffice to bring him there; and his second return would be completed.

We observe therefore that no part of the interval between the tenth of Nisan, and the time of the arrival in Galilee, admits of doubt or uncertainty, except the intermediate portion which was passed in Judæa. It is here consequently that a difference of opinion between harmonists begins to appear; and it is upon the length of this interval in particular, that the true measure of the hiatus in the former accounts, as supplied by the last, mainly depends. The extent of that hiatus, up to the time of the preceding Passover, was sufficiently determinate; and could not exceed two months and one half in all: but from the time of the Passover downwards, to the time of the return into Galilee, it is left to conjecture only, for no other reason than the indefiniteness of the interval supposed to be transacted in Judæa. Nor is the length of the interval of slight importance in itself; for the duration of the ministry of the Baptist is greatly affected by it: and it has so much to do with the merits of different schemes, as determined by the opinions of harmonists upon this particular question, that instead of squaring with each other, as they necessarily would do, if they were all agreeable to the truth, they may vary by many months, either in excess or in defect, in respect both to each other and to the reality. Yet notwithstanding this uncertainty, I think it may be shewn that our Saviour's stay in Judæa was neither more nor less than a month; or in other words, that he set out, on his return into Galilee, within forty days after the tenth of Nisan.

It is clear from the testimony of St. John, that the ministry of the Baptist went on, as before, for some time after the ministry of our Lord was begun; that is, that while the disciples of Jesus, wheresoever he

was in Judæa, were baptizing there, John also was still baptizing in Ænon, near to Salem ; in other words, that they were baptizing in conjunction, and converts were resorting to each. This united ministry continued some time. But the reputation of Jesus must have daily increased above the reputation of John ; and the popularity, if I may so call it, of the baptism administered by his disciples, must have daily become superior to that of John's : as the intermediate event, John iii. 25, 26, alone is sufficient to prove.

The eyes of the Pharisees, then, which had been hitherto fixed with no friendly intention upon John, began naturally to be turned towards Jesus : the knowledge of which fact, and the implied desire of retiring from their observation, are assigned as the reasons^s which determined him to remove out of Judæa ; (where he was necessarily subject to their inspection, if not to their jurisdiction ;) into Galilee, where he would be comparatively safe from both. All this time the ministry of John was still going on ; and, though with diminished celebrity, it had not yet ceased. The very proœm of the fourth chapter, rightly translated, demonstrates this ; When, therefore, the Lord knew that the Pharisees *have heard* that Jesus *is making* and *baptizing* more disciples than John, he left Judæa, and went away again into Galilee. To justify such a mode of speaking, both must have been making disciples and baptizing at the same time ; but Jesus in greater numbers than John. If so, when our Lord set out on this return, John was not yet cast into prison. But according to the other evangelists, by the time that he arrived in Galilee on this very return, John was. Now in the course of the journey, even after leaving Judæa and before he arrived in Galilee, besides the time taken

^s John iv. 1—3.

up in travelling thither, he spent two days at Sychar. If then, when our Lord set out from Judæa, John was still at large; he was not imprisoned before Jesus came into Samaria: and if when our Lord was returned into Galilee, John was no longer at liberty; he must have been imprisoned before he arrived there. He must have been imprisoned consequently while Jesus was still in Samaria: and if this was actually the case, then, however near they may approach to an inconsistency with each other, St. John and the other evangelists are exactly in unison, and each is borne out by the matter of fact.

It has been already supposed^t that Ascension-day, or the forty-first day from the fourteenth of Nisan, *exclusive*, being the precise termination of our Saviour's personal ministry, at the latest of its extremes, U. C. 783, in the sixteenth of Tiberius; the same day was probably its precise beginning, at the other extreme, U. C. 780, in the thirteenth of the same reign: and as the ministry of our Saviour in person, from the time of the imprisonment of John, took up and perpetuated *his* ministry not only in the order of succession, but also in the kind and character of its functions; it became a plausible conjecture that the precise beginning of our Lord's ministry was the precise termination of John's: that is, in other words, that the day of the imprisonment of John, which must have been some determinate day in particular, was the very day, U. C. 780, in the thirteenth of Tiberius Cæsar, on which our Lord ascended into heaven, U. C. 783, in the sixteenth. It will be shewn also hereafter^u that, whensoever John was imprisoned, it is most probable that the day of his imprisonment was some time in the spring. Now by a reference to the table of Jewish feasts in Dissertation vii.

^t Vol. ii. 150. Dissertation xix.

^u Vide the Appendix.

of vol. i. the day of Pentecost, U. C. 783, will be seen to have fallen on May 26; and consequently the day answering to Ascension-day, ten days before that, fell on May 16. If we are right then in the conjecture upon which we are proceeding, May 16, the date of the Ascension into heaven, U. C. 783, was also the date of the imprisonment of John, U. C. 780. It was the date also of our Lord's arrival in Galilee, and consequently of his departure from Sychar. The day of his arrival in Sychar therefore was either May 14 or May 13; the former, if the day of his arrival was included in the days of his residence there; the latter, if it was exclusive of them. Now the same table of feasts will shew that the Passover, U. C. 780, was celebrated on April 9; and the Paschal feast expired upon April 16, which coincided with Nisan 21. In this case, if we suppose that our Lord left Jerusalem upon April 17 or 18, and arrived at Sychar on May 13 or 14; the length of his previous residence in Judæa, down to the time when he set out for Galilee, might be twenty-six or twenty-seven days, very little less than one month; and in support of this conclusion we may argue further as follows:

I. This interval is not inconsistent with the fullest import of the terms, in which the evangelist speaks of its duration; *καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβε*^v. The same expression occurs^w to describe another similar residence in Judæa; of which it is capable of proof that it could not have lasted even so long as a month.

II. It is adequate to account for the intervening particulars on record; for the commencement, continuance, and progress of the work of baptizing by our Lord's disciples; for the increasing celebrity of his reputation; and the comparative decrease of John's; for the jealousy produced by this cause in the disciples

of the latter; for the attention to the conduct or the pretensions of Jesus, beginning to be excited in the sanhedrim; for the expediency on prudential considerations of our Lord's withdrawing himself from their personal cognizance; and the commencement accordingly of his journey into Galilee. And yet it may not be more than sufficient for this purpose, or no more than we may well suppose would be requisite to bring all these things to pass.

III. That a little before this departure John was baptizing no longer at Bethabara, but in Ænon, near Salem^x, because there was *much water there*; after what has been elsewhere observed already^y, in conjunction with what will be shewn more fully hereafter, may justly be considered a proof that the rainy season had been some time over, and water was beginning to be scarce; as would necessarily be the case a little before the feast of Pentecost, nearer to midsummer than to the vernal equinox: but not at the opposite quarter of the year. According to Eusebius and Jerome^z, Ænon and Salem were both about eight Roman miles distant from Scythopolis, the ancient Bethshan; which Josephus^a places at one hundred and twenty stades from Tiberias, on the southern extremity of the Lake of Galilee*. Whether they were on the Galilæan or the Peræan side of the Jordan, is decided, in favour of the former, by John iii. 23. 26, where Ænon is opposed to *πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*.

* Epiphanius, i. 469. C. Melchisedeciani, ii: mentions another Salem, in the neighbourhood of Sychem or Neapolis: which however would be in Samaria. This is probably the Shalem, mentioned Genesis xxxiii.

18, as a city of Shechem. The name of Ænon denotes that natural springs must have existed in that quarter; for the word in the Hebrew means "springs."

^x Ch. iii. 23.
409. *ad med.* De Situ et Nominibus.

^y Vol. i. 372. Dissertation xi.

^z Operum ii. Pars i^a.

^a Vita, 65. p. 97.

IV. If St. John's computation of hours throughout his Gospel is, as there is reason to conclude^b, the same neither with the Jewish nor with the Roman, (which were in fact alike,) but with the modern; the sixth hour, when our Lord arrived at Gerizim^c, was either six in the morning, or six in the evening; at both which times, after the autumnal equinox and near to midwinter it would necessarily be dark; but at each of them, after the vernal equinox and near to midsummer, it would still be open day. The very distance of the frontiers of Judæa from Sychar confirms the supposition, that the time was either evening or morning in the present instance; for we cannot calculate that distance, from any part of Judæa, at less than twenty-seven or twenty-eight miles^d; and from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem or of Jericho it would be half as many more. If our Lord travelled that distance in one day, he could not arrive before six at night; and if he travelled twenty miles of it on one day, he might yet accomplish the other seven or eight before six in the morning of the next.

That he arrived at the usual period of some meal appears from ch. iv. 8; and that both *πρωτὴ*, the first hour of the day, and *ὀψία*, the first hour of the night, were stated periods of eating among the Jews, is also a well known fact. In the summer season too, the morning or evening, and not the middle of the day, is notoriously the most convenient time in the East for travelling, and the most commonly selected for that purpose; and yet, at the same season, the heat of the sun even in the morning would be such before six o'clock, that one who had travelled for an hour or two after

^b Vide Townson's Discourses on the Gospels. Discourse viii. part i. and ii.

^c Ch. iv. 6.

^d Reland, Palæstina, ii. cap. iv. 416. cap. v. 423. iii. 1007. Sichem.

sunrise, might well be weary with his journey, as Jesus is said to have been ^e.

It favours the presumption, respecting the time of our Lord's arrival at Gerizim, that shortly afterwards a Samaritan woman came thither to fetch water: for the customs of the East have always been invariable, both in assigning this kind of menial service to the women in particular, and in fixing on morning or evening for sending them upon it*^f. That there were wells likewise, of great antiquity and of very elaborate construction, still to be met with in Judæa, is attested by Origen, *contra Celsum*^g. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ φρέατα ἐν γῇ Φιλιστιαίων κατεσκευάσται ὑπὸ τῶν δικαίων, ὡς ἐν τῇ Γενέσει ἀναγέγραπται, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν δεικνυμένων ἐν τῇ Ἀσκάλωνι θαυμαστῶν φρεάτων, καὶ ἱστορίας ἀξίων, διὰ τὸ ξένον καὶ παρηλλαγμένον τῆς κατασκευῆς ὡς πρὸς τὰ λοιπὰ φρέατα†.

* Gen. xxiv. 11: the time of evening is specified ἀπλῶς as the time when women go out to draw water.

It was evening, when the disciples being sent into Jerusalem to prepare the last supper, met the man returning with the pitcher of water.

Xenophon, *Anabasis*, iv. v. 9: πορευομένων δὲ, Χειρίσοφος μὲν ἀμφὶ κνέφας πρὸς κώμην ἀφικνεῖται, καὶ ὑδροφορούσας ἐκ τῆς κώμης γυναῖκας καὶ κόρας πρὸς τῇ κρήνῃ καταλαμβάνει, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἐρύματος.

Yet Theocritus, *Idyll*. v. 126, refers to morning: ρεῖτω χ' ἃ Συβαρίτις ἐμὴν μέλι· καὶ τὸ ποτ' ὄρθρον | ἃ παῖς ἀνθ' ὕδατος τῇ κάλπιδι κηρία βάψαι. Cf. Euripidis *Electra*, 55, 56. 102, 107—109.

It is still the custom in the East for the women to fetch water only at these two times in the day. Vide Harmer's *Observations*, vol. i. chapter iii. Obs. iii. note to page 167. Also chapter iv. Obs. xl. page 370, 371: and vol. iii. chapter v. Obs. lxviii. note to page 254: whence it appears that the evenings, however, are more usually selected for such a purpose than the mornings.

† That the woman came out of the neighbouring city, is so obviously implied in the account, as to make it superfluous even to remind the reader of this fact, had not Bretschneider, in his paradoxical work on the genuineness of St. John's Gos-

^e Ch. iv. 6. ^f 1 Sam. ix. 11. Mark xiv. 13. Luke xxii. 10. ^g *Operum* i. 537. B. C. *Contra Celsum*, iv. 44. Vide also Eusebius et Hieronymus, *Operum* ii. Pars 1^a. 471. *ad calcem*: De Situ et Nominibus. Φρέαρ ὄρκον.

The rate of travelling anciently for a day's journey on foot, which, in Arbuthnot's Tables of ancient Coins, Weights, and Measures, is estimated at thirty-three English miles, is probably beyond the truth; since, one day with another, we cannot suppose it to have exceeded the average standard of five or six and twenty Roman miles. It is repeatedly asserted by Josephus, that the

pel, thought proper, from iv. 7. *ἔρχεται γυνή ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας*, to suppose that she came from the city of Samaria; two hours' journey at least from Mount Gerizim; and to draw an inference, from the absurdity of such a supposition, disparaging to the accuracy of the evangelist^h. By so doing he has betrayed, in the first place, a want of discernment or a want of candour, in not perceiving or not acknowledging, that *γυνή ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας*, in this passage, is plainly equivalent to *ἡ γυνή ἡ Σαμαρεῖτις*, in anotherⁱ; and both describe merely a native of Samaria, in opposition to one of Judæa or of Galilee. Secondly, an inattention to contemporary history; that there was now no city of Samaria; but since the ancient Samaria had been rebuilt by Herod, that its modern name was Sebaste^k. Nor is it of any avail to oppose to this assertion the testimony of Acts viii. 5, which speaks of *πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας*. If that meant the city of Samaria, the Greek idiom would require *εἰς πόλιν*, or *εἰς τὴν πόλιν*, *Σαμαρείαν*; as at Acts xi. 5, *ἐν*

πόλει Ἰόππῃ. We know not consequently what city of Samaria is intended in that passage; but, if it was the city of which Simon Magus himself was a native, then according to Justin Martyr^l, it was a city called Triton or Githon. Thirdly, a total disregard to the context^m; which shews clearly that the city from which this woman came, and the city to which she returned, and the city near which our Saviour originally arrived, and where he subsequently stayed two days, were all one and the same, Shechem, Sichem, Sicima or Sychar; for it is called by each of these names indifferently; situated formerly within the tribe of Ephraimⁿ; and after a Roman colony had been planted by Vespasian either on its site, or within one Roman mile of its site^o, better known by the name of Flavia Neapolis; and the birthplace of Justin, the philosopher and martyr P. Its proximity to Mount Gerizim is attested by Josephus—*Σίκιμα . . . κειμένην πρὸς τῷ Γαριζεῖν ὄρει*—*τὸ ὄρος τὸ Γαριζεῖν ὑπέρεκείται δὲ τῆς Σικίμων πόλεως* q.

h iii. 17. 98. i Ch. iv. 9. k Jos. Ant. Jud. xiii. x. 2. xv. viii. 5. Bell. i. ii. 7. Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangelica, vii. 329. D: Chronicon Armeno-Lat. Pars ii. 247: Strabo, xvi. 2. §. 34. 356: *Σαμαρείαν, ἣν Ἡρώδης Σεβαστὴν ἐπωνόμασεν*. l Apologia i. 38. l. 13. m Ch. iv. 5. 8. 28. 30. 39. n Josh. xxiv. 32. o Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum, Apud Relandi Palæstinam, ii. iv. 416. p Apologia i. 3. l. 3. q Ant. Jud. xi. viii. 6. v. vii. 2. Vide also iv. viii. 44. v. l. 19.

ordinary length of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, even by the shortest route, viz. through Samaria, was an interval of three days' time; though it was certainly possible that it might be accomplished in two. The calculation of Reland^r shews that from Jerusalem, through Bethel or Bethar, and by Sichem or Neapolis, in the usual and at the same time the most direct route to the lake of Tiberias in Galilee; it was a distance of seventy-three Roman miles; which is an average of twenty-four Roman miles to a day*.

The distance of Bethel or Bethar, on the confines of Samaria and Judæa, was twenty-eight Roman miles from Sychar^t; a distance which might therefore be accomplished, without any great or unusual exertion, in one day's time. Hence, if we may only assume that the place of our Saviour's residence in Judæa, before this departure through Samaria into Galilee, was

* This ordinary or average rate of travelling for pedestrians is well illustrated by a parallel case, the distance between Cæsarea and Joppa, and the length of time taken up in travelling over it. This distance, by the help of the *Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum* and that of Antoninus conjointly, is calculated by Reland^s at forty-one Roman miles: for though that was properly the distance between Cæsarea, and Lydda or Diospolis, yet Lydda and Joppa, as referred to Cæsarea, in point of distance were almost on a par.

Now, if we compare together Acts x. 30. 3. 33. 8. 9. 23. 24, it will appear that the messengers of Cornelius were dispatched from Cæsarea on the

day after his vision of the angel; they arrived in Joppa on the day after they set out, about the sixth hour of the day; Peter set out with them back on the following morning; and they all arrived in Cæsarea about the ninth hour of the ensuing day: on the *fourth* day from the day of the vision *exclusive*. It thus appears that the distance between Cæsarea and Joppa, viz. forty-one Roman miles, was as nearly as possible one ordinary day's journey and an half: and yet at the rate of twenty-six or twenty-seven miles to a day. On the subject of a day's journey, however, and the proper standard of measurement for it, see the Appendix.

^r Palæstina, ii. cap. iv. 416. cap. v. 423. ii. 416. 423. iii. 637. Bethel.

^s Ibid. ii. 445.

^t Palæstina,

Bethel or its vicinity, it becomes a probable inference that he travelled from thence to Sychar in one day; and consequently that he arrived in the evening. Now Bethel was contiguous to Ephraim; and it is rendered probable that our Lord was residing at Bethel, or near it, on this occasion, because we have St. John's assurance that he was residing at Ephraim^u, and consequently near to Bethel, on the only similar occasion hereafter, which is specified in the course of his history. This then is the conclusion in which we may finally acquiesce; viz. that Jesus arrived at Sychar after travelling one whole day: and, therefore, if he arrived at the sixth hour, that he arrived at six in the evening. The day of his arrival, as it has been shewn already, was probably May 13; the dates of his two days' residence would be consequently May 14 and 15; and the day of his departure into Galilee would be May 16: upon which coincidences, as I shall have occasion to revert to them again hereafter, I shall make no further remark at present, except this: that according to my own calculation of the days of the week, May 13 was a Thursday, and May 16 was a Sunday*.

V. When our Lord was actually arrived in Galilee, the Galilæans, it is said^v, received him; having seen all things which he did in Jerusalem at the feast: for they also went to the feast. This feast twice referred to, as it is impossible to doubt, is the feast spoken of first, ii. 13, and again, ii. 23; that is, the feast of the Passover in the thirteenth of Tiberius Cæsar: and the miracles performed at that feast are the miracles referred to expressly at ii. 23, and impliedly at

* If John was imprisoned on May 13, that was the day of the week on which Jesus ascended

into heaven; if on May 16, that was the day of the month.

^u xi. 54.

^v John iv. 45.

iii. 2. We may conclude then that our Lord had never been in Galilee, since the time of the attendance of the Galilæans at that feast, and the time of the performance of those miracles, which they had seen, and still remembered to have seen performed at that feast, until now; when he came among them directly from Samaria. It follows, therefore, that he came among them in the interval between that feast and the next; that is, between the Passover and the Pentecost both in this year; and not between the Passover, and any other feast later than Pentecost.

For if the favourable reception, now given to Jesus by the people of Galilee, was solely on the strength of the miracles which they knew and remembered him to have performed, when they and he met in conjunction at the Passover; the inference appears to me irresistible, that he and the people of Galilee had never met again, or at least never met any where, either in Jerusalem or out of it, when miracles had been performed, or by the people of Galilee in particular had been seen to be performed; from that time to this. This was both possible and probable, if our Lord had performed miracles before the eyes of the Galilæans at one feast, and come among them in person before the next, and spent the intermediate time apart from Galilee, where he performed either no miracles, or none which were known to or observed by them. But it is not so on any other supposition; either that Jesus and the people of Galilee had met again in Jerusalem at other feasts, since the Passover, and yet that no miracles, which might be known and remembered as well as those at the Passover, were then performed; or that though other feasts had since transpired, Jesus and the people of Galilee had never met at Jerusalem except at the feast of the Passover before them all. Each of these hypo-

theses carries with it its own refutation. During the short interval of a single month, between the close of the Paschal week and the return into Galilee, when our Saviour was somewhere in Judæa; it is not incredible that the Galilæans should have seen or even heard nothing of him; and yet that, when he actually appeared among them, they should still have retained a lively recollection of his miracles at the Passover, not long before. But it is utterly inconceivable either that our Lord himself should have passed upwards of the first eight months of his ministry, in comparative inactivity; or that if he and the people of Galilee had ever met in Jerusalem again, the proofs of his character and of his mission, exhibited eight months before, should have been the only grounds of conviction, to account for the cheerfulness of his reception among them now.

VI. Οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε· ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνόν ἐστι, καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδού, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας, ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσι πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη. John iv. 35. The natural inference from such an address as this is, that the speaker is calling the attention of his hearers to some sensible fact; and though beneath this sensible illustration a spiritual meaning were to be couched, this should make no difference: for every sign is something *per se* as well as in its signification; and even where the external medium is most analogous to the inward verity, and the sign as such is the best qualified for its proper signification, yet that nature of its own remains the same as before. Whatever end then our Lord might have in view by inviting to the contemplation of a sensible image, he must still be referring to *such* an image; to the observation of an *actual* fact; to the state of the country around him; to the ripeness of the corn, and therefore the approach of the harvest season. To lift up the

eyes in the first place, and to survey the fields in the next, were manifestly literal acts; which it would be absurd to understand in any but their literal sense. Yet they were designed as preliminary to *one* effect, which was the sensible impression in question; and therefore this sensible impression also must have been a literal impression, derived from the matter of fact.

If a figurative import is put upon this effect, however incongruous to the simplicity of the acts which precede, it can still make it signify only one thing; viz. that the fields were to be seen crowded with those among whom the spiritual harvest of our Saviour's ministry either had begun, or was about to begin; which crowding at least must have been a matter of fact. If so, the crowds, which were thronging the fields at the time, were the crowds of Samaritans, flocking from Sychar; for our Lord was now on Gerizim, and near no place but that; and these inhabitants of Sychar were the proper subjects of our Saviour's ministry, as either already begun, or about to begin ere long. But in this case, I put it to the judgment of my reader, whether the resort from Sychar, produced merely by the report of a single woman, even had it by this time taken place, and our Lord and his disciples had not been still alone on the mountain; could be so considerable as to fill the country; and still more, whether Samaritans in general, or these Samaritans in particular, can on any principle be supposed to be meant by the proper subjects of our Saviour's ministry, either present or to come; of that ministry, which had yet been begun only in Judæa, and was about to be prosecuted or resumed only in Galilee; and ever after was destined to be continued among the inhabitants of these two regions, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, exclusively.

There is no proof that our Saviour was ever in

Samaria at all, except on this occasion at the very beginning, and on another at the very end of his ministry; and then also as only travelling through, not preaching in that country: but there is proof that on two occasions^w—once, actually, and a second time, virtually—he forbade those, whom he sent out to assist in the discharge of his own commission, and consequently among the same persons, and on the same work with himself; either to enter into a city of Samaritans, or to go away into the direction of the Gentiles; which was to place Samaritans and Gentiles on a par. It is not indeed to be denied, that the work of our Saviour's ministry, or rather those among whom and for whom this work was to be performed, are figuratively called the *harvest*; and the metaphor when so applied is perfectly just and beautiful. But it is never so applied, except ἀπλωσ; never in such strange and incongruous terms as the fields *being white* for the harvest: between which representation, and the idea of a concourse or resort of people, however great, there is no possible affinity whatever. The fields being *ripe*, or the fields being *full* for the harvest, might answer in some measure to this idea; but the fields being *white* for the harvest can answer to nothing but the sensible fact of the forwardness of the corn; when its original green or brown is actually changed to a light yellow, resembling white.

What then shall we say to the first part of the declaration? The allusion is to a *proverb*; and its connection with what follows may be thus explained. When the seed is first sown, is it not a common saying, that there are yet four months, and the harvest or reaping time will come? Lift up your eyes, survey the country round about, and be convinced, by the

^w Matt. x. 5. Luke x. 1.

whiteness of the fields, that the four months are drawing to a close; and that the season of the reaping is at hand. The end which was proposed by the reference to this natural phenomenon may also be explained as follows. This ripeness of the visible and the natural harvest, now that the period requisite to the maturity of the seed is accomplished, may be an earnest to you of the ripeness of that as yet unseen and spiritual harvest, to bring which to maturity will be the object of *my* personal labours; but to reap which will be the object of *your's*: a ripeness consequently which will then be complete, when *my* ministry is over, and *your's* is about to begin.

Our Lord was speaking prophetically; and in the usual style of the language of prophecy, he was speaking of what was still future, as if it were already past. For he proceeds: ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασι, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε^x—where, if any one were to take these words to relate to a *past* mission of the disciples, he would be bound to shew when, and where, and for what purpose that mission took place. But if they do not relate to a *past*, they must relate to a *future* mission; and the way to render them will be this, I *shall* send you to reap that which you *shall* not have laboured for; others *shall* have laboured for it, and you *shall* enter into the effect of their labour. Two, as yet future, occasions in the course of our Saviour's lifetime on earth there were, when the disciples were sent out; once, upon the mission of the Twelve, and again, upon that of the Seventy: neither of which however can here be meant; because the state of the case supposes not one set of agents or workmen assisting another, and all preparing for a common result,

^x Ch. iv. 38.

but one set of agents or workmen succeeding to another, and stepping in by themselves to take up a certain result; whereas both the Twelve and the Seventy were sent out, as we saw^y, in the former of these capacities, not in the latter, and as fellow-labourers both of our Saviour and of the Baptist, in the work which they had each to perform.

There would however be a third such mission—but after the close of the personal ministry of Jesus Christ—the mission of the apostles in their proper character of the emissaries of Christianity, completing the purpose of the ministry of our Lord in his lifetime, by the commencement, the continuance, and the consummation of that scheme of formal Christianity, the establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth, to announce which, and to prepare for its reception in its proper time, was the object both of his ministry and of the Baptist's. This mission is here intended; and as referred to this every thing becomes natural and consistent. The effect of our Saviour's personal ministry and that of the Baptist's would be to have sown the seed, and to have raised to maturity the crop; but not to have begun the reaping, or gathered in the fruit: that would be reserved for the ministry of the apostles. And therefore it was also said: And he, that shall reap, shall earn his wages, and shall gather together fruit against everlasting life; that both he who is sowing, and he who is reaping, (or he who is to sow, and he who is to reap,) may rejoice in common. For herein, (that is, in this dispensation of one ministry succeeding and giving effect to another,) the saying shall truly consist, that he who is sowing is one, and he who is reaping is another: the ordinary sense of which proverb is merely to express the uncertain event of

^y *Supra*, Dissertation xix.

human schemes, by which it so often happens that the same hand does not both sow and reap; one party has had the anxiety and toil of the acquisition, while another steps in to the enjoyment*. How natural and pertinent, at the outset of our Saviour's ministry, such reflections as these were, is too obvious to require any proof.

There were two seasons of harvest among the Jews; the season of barley-harvest, the first-fruits of which were to be consecrated at the Passover; and the season of wheat-harvest, with which the same thing was done at the Pentecost^z. Of wheat-harvest in particular, Jerome, in Amos iv. 7, writes thus: *Prohibui a vobis imbrem, cum adhuc superessent tres menses usque ad messem; quæ appellatur pluvia serotina, et agris Palæstinæ arvisque sitientibus vel maxime necessaria est: ut ne, quando herba turgeret in messem, et triticum parturiret, nimia siccitate aresceret. significat autem vernum tempus extremi mensis Aprilis; a quo, usque ad messem frumenti, tres menses supersunt^a*. Between each of these seasons, and the corresponding seed time, there was literally an interval of four months: Consider now from this day and upward, from the four and twentieth day of the ninth *month*. . . . Is the seed yet in the barn? . . . from this day will I bless *you*^b. On which Jerome—Igitur decimus est mensis eo tempore quo semina latitant in terra; nec futura fæcunditas conjectari potest^c. Casleu, then, which in a rectified year answered nearly to our December, was the seed-time, four months before Nisan, or the period of barley-

* Suidas, ἀλλότριον ἀμᾶς θέρος· ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ ἀλλότρια καρπουμένων. Ibid. ἄλλοι κάμον, ἄλλοι ὤναντο.

Both these proverbial sayings are of a similar import to that in the text of St. John, iv. 37.

^z Philo ii. 206. l. 22—30. De Decem Oraculis: 294. l. 5—295. l. 31. De Sепtenario et Festis Diebus. ^a Operum iii. 1401. *ad principium*. ^b Haggai ii. 18, 19. ^c Operum iii. 1702. *ad principium*.

harvest; and according to Maimonides^d, the wheat designed for the bread, *Ad altaris ferta, et libamina*, was sown seventy days before the Passover, so as to be ripe at the Pentecost, fifty days after it; that is, the harvest was just one hundred and twenty days, or literally four solar months later than the sowing-time. Diodorus Siculus asserts the same thing of Egypt: τὸ σπέρμα βάλλοντας...μετὰ τέτταρας ἢ πέντε μῆνας ἀπαντᾶν ἐπὶ τὸν θερισμόν^e. Nor, as we learn from Pliny, was wheat-harvest in that country later than the month of May. At the time of the Exodus from Egypt, when the vernal equinox coincided with April 5, the flax and the barley, it is said^f, were both destroyed by the hail, because both were at that time ripening; but the wheat and the rye were not destroyed, because they were neither of them arrived at maturity. The plague of hail must have taken place some time in the month of March, and very probably in its former half.

But that no literal seed-time could be meant in the present instance is well argued by Origen, in his Commentary upon the place^g. If the time, says he, when Jesus spake these words, was four months before the harvest, it is evident that it was winter. One harvest at least begins to take place in Judæa about the time of the month called among the Hebrews Nisan, when they are celebrating the Passover; so that they sometimes make their unleavened bread of new grain. But let us suppose that the harvest is not about that month, but about the next to that, the month which is called among them Jar; even in this case, a four months' time before that month is the depth of winter. When then we shall have shewn that, when he spake these words, it was about the season of harvest, either then

^d De Rebus Altari interdictis, vii. 4.^e Lib. i. 36.^f Exod. ix. 31. 32.^g Operum iv. 248. E. In Joh. Tomus xiii. 39.

at its maturity, or drawing perhaps to a close; we shall have demonstrated what we propose.

Of the appearance of things in the winter, Jerome in Zachariam gives this description^h—*Octavus apud Hebræos mensis, qui apud illos Maresvan apud nos November dicitur, hyemis exordium est: in quo, æstatis calore consumpto, omnis terra virore nudatur, et mortalium corpora contrahuntur, &c.*

From the testimony of this passage, therefore, which is the chief reason why some Harmonists (amongst whom archbishop Newcome is one) have thought it necessary to place the journey through Samaria in the month of December; we may consider it almost demonstratively certain, that the time of the journey coincided with the acme of wheat-harvest, or was but a little before it; which coincidence would be the case, if it occurred, where we suppose it to have occurred, two or three weeks before Pentecost. For I have supposed these words to be spoken on May 13: and the feast of Pentecost was coincident with May 30.

There is still another argument in favour of the same conclusion, taken from the order and succession of sabbatic years at this time; which though not less strong than any thing yet mentioned, I have reserved for a subsequent Dissertation by itself. And these points being presumptively established, it remains only that we should state the order of facts, during the rest of St. John's account, before it breaks off; and so make an end of this subject for the present.

After our Saviour's arrival in Galilee, he is brought again to Canaⁱ: but before this, we meet with the observation^j, For Jesus himself bore witness that a prophet hath no honour in his own country; where by his own country, Nazareth, the reputed place of his

^h Operum iii. 1707. *ad calcem.*

ⁱ iv. 46.

^j Ib. 44.

birth and the actual place of his bringing up, may very well be meant. Now if we consult the maps of Judæa, it will be seen that one, who was travelling from Samaria to Cana, would pass by Nazareth: and there is an account in St. Luke^k of a visit to Nazareth, at which the truth of the assertion that a prophet has little honour in his own country was verified by the event. It may be imagined then that this visit to Nazareth, in St. Luke, preceded the visit to Cana in St. John; and that the observation in question was expressly premised in reference to it: but this conclusion would be premature.

For first; the first miracle, after the return into Galilee, was wrought at this visit to Cana^l; and secondly; before Jesus came to Nazareth, one miracle or more had been performed at Capernaum^m. Now the miracle performed at Cana came to pass in Capernaum; for it was performed by our Lord *at* Cana on a sick person *in* Capernaum: and if the visit to Nazareth was only sufficiently later than the visit to Cana for the news of the miracle to spread from Capernaum to Nazareth, before our Lord came thither, this might be the miracle referred to. Now Nazareth was nearer to Capernaum, than Cana to Tiberias; and yet, according to Josephusⁿ, a man might ride from Cana* to Tiberias in a single night.

The use of the plural, *ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γυνόμενα*, though in reference to a single miracle, is so natural in relation to events made known by hearsay, and so familiar to the idiom of the Greek tongue—besides being exactly

* The Cana of the Gospels is the Kanah of the Old Testament, mentioned Joshua xix. 28,

among the cities of the tribe of Asher.

^k Ch. iv. 16.
Cf. De Bell. ii. xxi. 6.

^l John iv. 54.

^m Luke iv. 23.

ⁿ Vita, 16. 17.

parallel to Mark v. 19. 20, and Luke viii. 39—as to constitute no objection.

The visit to Cana then preceded the visit to Nazareth; and it supplies a link in the chain of the Gospel account, which would otherwise be perceptibly missed: for however true in itself it might be, that a miracle had been performed in Capernaum—yet neither the truth of that fact, nor the propriety of the allusion to it, would have appeared from St. Luke, independently of the light reflected upon it by St. John. And such being the benefit of the coincidence between the two accounts, it is unreasonable to question whether what possesses so happy an effect in clearing up the obscurity of the former evangelist, was intended to do so or not by the later. The declaration therefore at verse forty-four relates to nothing which Jesus can be supposed to have said, but to something which he was about to suffer. He had not yet testified, but he was shortly to testify in his own person, that a prophet had no honour in his own country; and when he did testify it, it would be by the example of the reception which he experienced, on the part either of his townsmen of Nazareth in particular, or of his countrymen of Galilee in general; with both of whom his ministry, though formally begun among them first, yet ultimately failed alike. It is not improbable, that this very visit to Nazareth was with a view to begin his ministry there; and the previous visit to Cana, with the second miracle which then took place, recalling perhaps the remembrance of the first, might be designed, amongst other uses, to prepare for that beginning. But on this subject something more will be said elsewhere °.

° Vide Dissertation xxiii. Part ii.

DISSERTATION XXII.

Coincidence of a sabbatic year with the beginning of our Saviour's ministry.

IT is a well-authenticated fact, that the sabbatic year was as strictly observed among the Jews, after the return from captivity, as it had ever been before it; and perhaps more so^a: καὶ τὸ ἑβδομον ἔτος ἀνείσφορον εἶναι—χωρὶς τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἔτους, ὃν Σαββατικὸν ἐνιαυτὸν προσαγορεύουσιν· ἐπειδὴ ἐν αὐτῷ μήτε ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων καρπὸν λαμβάνουσι, μήτε σπείρουσι^b—vide also the sequel of the same section. If this then was the case, and the journey through Samaria, considered in the last Dissertation, coincided with any part of a year of rest, it must be morally improbable that an allusion would, at that time, be made either to the usual period of sowing the seed, or to the ripeness of the corn and the proximity of the harvest. Nor does it constitute any difficulty that our Lord was in Samaria, and not in Judæa; for the Samaritans, as we may collect from the following passage in Josephus, observed the sabbatic year, as well and at the same times, as the Jews: ἀξιούντων δ' ἀφιέναι τὸν φόρον αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἐβδοματικοῦ ἔτους· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοὺς σπείρειν ἐν αὐτῷ^c, κ', τ. λ.

A year of rest began with seed-time in one year, and continued until seed-time in the next: and its observance consisted in leaving the lands uncultivated,

^a Maimonides, De Anno Jubilæi, passim.
xiv. x. 6.

^c Ant. Jud. xi. viii. 6.

^b Jos. Ant. Jud. xi. viii. 5.

the gardens and the vineyards untouched^d. There was consequently neither harvest nor ingathering during it, except of such productions of the soil as might spring up of themselves; and that too not as the property of the owners of the soil, but as open to all; or rather as especially the right of the poor and of the stranger.

Now there is clear proof in contemporary history of four different sabbatic years, at great distances of time from each other; any one of which being assumed as actually so, a table may be constructed of others, either before or after it, as may be requisite. The first of these years bears date from the seed-time of the 150th year of the *Æra Seleucidarum*, the first year of the Maccabean dynasty, as such; that is, B. C. 163^e: the second, from the seed-time in the first year of John Hyrcanus, dated from the death of his father; that is, the seed-time, B. C. 135^f: the third, from the seed-time of the year when Jerusalem was taken by Herod and Sosius; that is, as we saw elsewhere, B. C. 37*^g: the fourth, from the seed-time of the year, before the destruction of the city and of the temple of Jerusalem by Titus; that is, A. D. 69^h.

Besides these, there are three more, which, though not expressly declared to be such, yet have been proved, or will be proved, on strong grounds of presumption, to be soⁱ.

* The first of the passages referred to, in proof of this sabbatic year, speaks of its being such a year even before the arrival of the tenth of Tisri, B. C. 37, and while the siege of Jeru-

salem was still going on, during the summer, previously. But that it does so *proleptically*, appears very plainly from the other passage.

^d Exod. xxiii. 10, 11. Lev. xxv. 2—7. ^e 1 Macc. vi. 16. 26—49—54. vii. 1. Jos. Ant. Jud. xii. ix. 3. 5. ^f Ibid. xiii. viii. 1. Bell. i. ii. 4. Vide also the Appendix. ^g Ant. Jud. xiv. xvi. 2. xv. i. 2. Vol. i. 248. Dissertation v. ^h Maimonides, De Anno Jubilæi, i. 4. Mishna, and the Sedar Olam. ⁱ Vol. i. 256. Dissertation v. Vol. ii. 50. Dissertation xv. Vide also the Appendix.

The truth of the fact, in each of these instances, will be made apparent by the following Table; which extends from *Æræ Seleucidarum* 150, to A. D. 70, the year of the destruction of Jerusalem; and proceeding merely on the assumption that the first of the number was a sabbatic year, renders it demonstratively certain that the rest were all so likewise. Among these coincidences, those to which any argument is attached, are denoted by an asterisk.

Table of sabbatic years, from B.C. 163, Æræ Seleucidarum 150, to A. D. 70: every such year extending from the first of Tisri in one year, to the first of Tisri in the next.

Sabbatic years.	Urbis Conditiæ.		B. C.	
*I.	*591	to 592	*163	to 162
II.	598	599	156	155
III.	605	606	149	148
IV.	612	613	142	141
*V.	*619	620	*135	134
VI.	626	627	128	127
VII.	633	634	121	120
VIII.	640	641	114	113
IX.	647	648	107	106
X.	654	655	100	99
XI.	661	662	93	92
XII.	668	669	86	85
XIII.	675	676	79	78
XIV.	682	683	72	71
XV.	689	690	65	64
XVI.	696	697	58	57
XVII.	703	704	51	50
XVIII.	710	711	44	43
*XIX.	*717	718	*37	36
XX.	724	725	30	29
*XXI.	*731	732	*23	22
XXII.	738	739	16	15
XXIII.	745	746	9	8
XXIV.	752	753	2	1

Sabbatic years.	Urbis Condita.		A. D.	
XXV.	759 to	760	6 to	7
XXVI.	766	767	13	14
XXVII.	773	774	20	21
*XXVIII.	*780	781	*27	28
XXIX.	787	788	34	35
*XXX.	*794	795	*41	42
XXXI.	801	802	48	49
*XXXII.	*808	809	*55	56
XXXIII.	815	816	62	63
XXXIV.	822	823	69	70

Of the above years that, with which I am chiefly concerned at present, is the twenty-eighth in order; from U. C. 780, A. D. 27, to U. C. 781, A. D. 28. It is in this year, but in the first half of the year, U. C. 780, A. D. 27, and consequently *before* the periodical return of the sabbatic year, which did not begin until the September following; that I suppose the journey through Samaria to have taken place. There would be the regular harvest in this half of the year; and an allusion to the approaching season of reaping, or to the fulness of the fields around, not only might be possible, but if there was any vestige remaining of that particular Providence, which at a former period of the Jewish history was pledged to bless the sixth year in a triple proportion to any other^k, would be peculiarly apposite and striking.

On such an hypothesis, however, as should place the journey in the month of December in the same year, if there could be no regular seed-time, or process of sowing, then arrived or going on; neither could there be any allusion to it—much less any literal allusion, such as would necessarily imply that it was then arrived or then going on. I look upon this coincidence which, even according to my own arrangement, treads as

^k Lev. xxv. 20—22.

closely on the verge of an inconsistency, as without falling into it was possible, to be one which could be produced by the matter of fact alone.

It is not however to be withheld from the knowledge of the reader, that the calculation of sabbatic years, according to the received principles of the modern Jewish reckoning; (principles, which have been sanctioned by the authority of learned chronologers;) differ from the above, so far as in each instance to antedate the year in question, by placing it in the year before. Yet notwithstanding this, there can be little hesitation what mode of computation, in a case of this kind, ought to be followed, instead of what; whether the computation of the Jewish rabbis, or that of the book of Maccabees, and of Josephus. The author of that book and the Jewish historian, each of them contemporary with all or with part at least of the events which he records, could not be ignorant what years were observed in their own time, and among their own countrymen, as sabbatic years; nor by what rule the recurrence of them was determined. Much more inconceivable is it that four distinct and very distant years, such as those produced above, every one of which, as referred to its place in contemporary history, or to the succession of synchronous events, admits of being determined on purely independent grounds, which have nothing to do with the assumption that it was or was not a sabbatic year; should all be asserted to be such, and all be found on comparison to be such, if they were not each actually such. No such coincidence between them could be the effect of chance; and yet the assertion, though individually and independently made of each, is impliedly true of all; for if any one of them was a sabbatic year, the rest must have been so likewise.

With respect indeed to the last; that is, to the year

before the destruction of Jerusalem; the assertion, *a priori*, may be said to rest on tradition merely: but this year was in all respects so memorable, and so characterised in the annals of Jewish history by its momentous and melancholy interest above all others before or after it, that what tradition perpetuates of this year, even *a priori*, it may be supposed, should be implicitly to be trusted: and tradition certainly hands down this fact, that the temple was destroyed, and Jerusalem was taken by Titus, In exitu anni sabbatici; that is, when a sabbatic year was drawing to its close. There is nothing in Josephus, which can be shewn to militate against this tradition; and there are some things, which may be considered virtually to confirm it; for I do not say that he has any where expressly asserted it.

He speaks in one passage of the harvest of a certain year, and of such of its productions as were ripe, which the context shews was just after the Passover of U. C. 821, the beginning of the third year of the war, and the year of the death of Nero¹; and in another, directly after, with a fresh allusion to the productions of the ground, he speaks of the land as *ἐνεργὸς* at the time^{* m}; which is clearly a description of no sabbatic year. In another passage he alludes to magazines of corn, which had been some time laid up in Jerusalem, and were destroyed by the contending parties in their rage against each other, a little before Titus invested the cityⁿ. Now Titus laid siege to the city at the Passover, U. C. 823. These magazines then could consist in no part of the stores reserved from the harvest of U. C.

* The context of this allusion proves that it was soon after winter, U. C. 822.

¹ Bell. iv. vii. 2. ix. 2.

^m iv. ix. 4. 7. 8.

ⁿ v. i. 4. xiii. 7.

823, but they might be formed in part out of those of the harvest of the year before, the harvest of U. C. 822. He speaks in another^o of the besieged in Jerusalem creeping out of the city by night, in search of grass and wild herbs, to allay their hunger; and such like extremities; which by implying the absence of all but the spontaneous productions of the ground, so far describe a sabbatic year.

But the most decisive indication of the fact appears to me to be furnished at v. xii. 4; where it is said that the Roman army was supplied, during the siege, in whatever abundance, with corn not grown, nor procured on the spot, but imported from Syria and the neighbouring provinces. From the midsummer of U. C. 822, when Vespasian was declared emperor, and even from that of U. C. 821, when Nero was deposed, the progress of the war had been altogether suspended, and Judæa in great measure had been evacuated by the Roman armies*—until Titus renewed hostilities by laying siege to the city in the spring of U. C. 823. Hence, if from the autumn of U. C. 822, to the summer of U. C. 823, had not been a sabbatic year, it is morally certain that the country would have been, more or less, cultivated as usual; and the Romans, who came before Jerusalem at the Passover, but did not take it until the following September, would have surprised each description of harvest, both the barley-harvest and the wheat-harvest, untouched upon the ground. In this case, they must have been converted, at least in part, to the supply of the wants of the besiegers; and Jo-

* So Tacitus, *Historiæ*, v. 10: vili bello intentus, quantum ad Proximus annus, (U. C. 822) ci- Judæos per otium transiit.

sephus could scarcely have failed to give some hint, which would have led to this discovery *.

The question which concerns the succession of sabbatic years, at this period of Jewish history, has nothing to do with the further question of the years of jubile; for since the return from captivity, though the former were still observed, the latter according to Maimonides ^p were not. At what time, even after the return, that observance itself began, is a very uncertain point. There is no distinct evidence of it either in the book of Ezra, or in that of Nehemiah, or in the writings of the contemporary prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, or Malachi: and it would be premature to conclude from Neh. viii. 1, 2. that, because the reading of the Law then took place; viz. on the first day of the seventh month; that was necessarily in a year of release. What year of the mission of Nehemiah even this might be, whether the same year with that of the building of the wall, which would be its first year; or some other later than it; (for he was twelve years in Judæa altogether;) is uncertain: but whatever year it was, the reading of the Law, as part of the ceremonial of the year of release, was fixed to the feast of Tabernacles, that is, to the fifteenth of the month Tisri at the earliest ^q; whereas this reading took place on the first: which proves that, however natural and appropriate such an act might be at any time in itself, yet as referred to that specific direction it was out of course. Such a ceremony however on the first of Tisri

* Josephus records a fact, Ant. Jud. xx. ix. 2, before the first feast of Tabernacles in the administration of Albinus, which shews plainly that the year, when it happened, was not a

sabbatic year. Now it may be proved that this first feast of Tabernacles was that of U.C. 815; which would be still in the sixth of the cycle, *exeunte*.

^p De Anno Jubilæi, i. 3.

^q Deut. xxxi. 10, 11.

would coincide with the feast of Trumpets, Lev. xxiii. 24. Numb. xxix. 1: which was probably the reason why it then took place; for the feast of Trumpets was a sabbath.

There is in fact no well authenticated instance of a sabbatic year, after the return from captivity, before B.C. 163, the first year of Judas Maccabæus. From this date if we calculate backwards, and suppose the Jews to have returned from captivity in the first of Cyrus, B.C. 536; the second year after that return *exclusive*, B.C. 534, ought to have been a sabbatic year; for $534 - 163 = 371$, a number divisible by seven without a remainder. According to the Jewish reckoning, the year before this, B.C. 535, must have been so; and that being only one year after the return, almost before the new colony could have settled themselves in the country, and certainly before they could yet have entered on the full enjoyment of its increase; the very statement of this supposition is enough to convict it of absurdity. In the third year after their restoration, the Jews might perhaps keep a year of rest; but none so early as the second.

I do not think however that any such observance had yet been begun, or at least duly kept up, from after the return, until the period of the covenant solemnly entered into in the time of Nehemiah both by princes and by people; one article of which was, that they would leave the year of rest—as well as observe the other ritual ordinances of the Law^r. The precise date of this covenant may be an uncertainty; but we may conclude, from its very nature, that it would much more probably be made while a sabbatic year was still a year or two distant, than when one was either arrived, or on the point of arriving. If it was made

in the first year of Nehemiah's mission; (and this, on every account, appears most probable—see ch. vi. 15. ii. 1. 11. viii. 2. 13. 14. 18. ix. 1. 38. x. 31;) it was made B. C. 444, one year before a sabbatic year. The first year of this description, calculated downwards to B. C. 163 as before, would fall out B. C. 443.

The decision of this whole question, indeed, would be easy, if the results to be established in succeeding Dissertations of the present work might now be implicitly taken for granted. For I shall shew hereafter^s that the cycle of sabbatic years, as such, began B. C. 1520, or B. C. 1513, indifferently; that is, either in the year of the Eisodus itself, or in the year next after the date of the division of the lands, B. C. 1514; and the accuracy of this computation will be further confirmed, by its agreement with a case in point, a sabbatic year, bearing date B. C. 709, after the deliverance of Jerusalem from the invasion of Sennacherib, in the reign of Hezekiah. Let us consider B. C. 1507—B. C. 1506, the first sabbatic year as such. On this principle, B. C. 534—B. C. 533 would be the hundred and fortieth of the series; for $1507 - 534 = 973 = 7 \times 139$. In like manner B. C. 443—442, would be the hundred and fifty-third; for $1507 - 443 = 1064 = 7 \times 152$.

There is an intimation in the book of Jeremiah^t, from which it may be collected that the ninth year of Zedekiah (according to the Bible chronology, B. C. 590—589) coincided either wholly or in part with a year of release^u. The covenant, to which that passage alludes, was entered into first at a time when the Chaldean army was before Jerusalem; and was broken again upon their temporary departure, to oppose the Egyptians^v. After this, the siege of the city was re-

^s Vide the Appendix. ^t Ch. xxxiv. 8—22. ^u Exod. xxi. 2. Deut. xv. 12.
^v Jer. xxxiv. 21. xxxvii. 5—11.

sumed on the tenth of Tebeth, the tenth month in the Jewish year, in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah^w; and it was prosecuted from that time forward, without any second interruption, until the ninth day of the fourth month, in the eleventh of the reigning king. I think there can be little question concerning this fact; and therefore, that the previous siege, which was raised for a time by the approach of the Egyptians, made no part of the eighteen months' interval, dated from the tenth of Tebeth in the ninth of Zedekiah; but was a prior incident belonging to the earlier part of the same year, either in the summer, or at least in the autumn*. Nor is it to be supposed that the Chaldean army would have laid siege to Jerusalem first in the tenth month; (that is, in the depth of a Jewish winter;) unless that siege was merely the *resumption* of what had been begun before; and not the *commencement* of what had never been attempted until then. Nor is it probable that the expedition from Egypt, which was manifestly intended for the relief of Jerusalem, would have been made except in the summer time, at the usual season of military operations in general; nor consequently that the report of its approach, which was evidently received just after the siege was begun, could have been received except in the summer.

If so the siege, which was broken up for a time by the rumoured approach of the Egyptian army, was altogether a different transaction from the siege which

* Josephus, Ant. Jud. x. vii. 4, understands this fact in the same manner. The siege, as laid to Jerusalem on the *tenth* day of the *tenth* month, in the

ninth of Zedekiah, he considers a *second* siege, which lasted from that time forward eighteen months.

was begun in the tenth month afterwards. Yet there is no reason why both should not be supposed to have made part of the transactions of the same year: the one about its middle, the other much nearer its end.

On this principle, the first siege also would be laid in the ninth of Zedekiah, and according to the Bible chronology, some time in B.C. 590; about the middle of that year. At this particular juncture, a year of release was either arrived, or at hand; and, if the latter was the case, it would extend from B.C. 590—B.C. 589. If B.C. 709—B.C. 708 was actually a sabbatic year, then B.C. 590—B.C. 589 must have been, or ought to have been one also: for $709 - 590 = 119 = 7 \times 17$: whence if B.C. 709—B.C. 708 was the first of this series, B.C. 590—589 was the eighteenth.

In Pingré's Table of Eclipses, I find an eclipse of the moon, B.C. 590, on March 12, at 8. 45. in the morning for the meridian of Paris; or 10. 57. in the morning for the meridian of Jerusalem. The next mean full moon to this would fall on April 10, at 11. 41. in the evening: in which case the 15th of Nisan would coincide with April 11, and therefore the 15th of Tisri with October 5. From the 15th of Tisri *exclusive*, to the 10th of Tebeth *inclusive*, the interval is eighty-three days. And from the 5th of October *exclusive*, to the 27th of December *inclusive*, it is the same. In this case, the tenth of the Jewish Tebeth coincided with the twenty-seventh of the Julian December; and the siege of Jerusalem, which began on the former, began also on the latter. If it began therefore B.C. 590, it began B.C. 590 *exeunte*; and if it lasted, from the time of its beginning to the time of its close, eighteen months in all; and if the last month of the siege expired on the ninth of the fourth month of the Jewish year, B.C. 588—the sixth month expired on

the ninth of the fourth month of the same year, B.C. 589—and, consequently, the first began on the tenth of the tenth, B.C. 590.

Now it has been shewn^x, at least with presumptive certainty, that B.C. 588, when the 14th of Nisan coincided with April 17—April 17 was a Sunday. On the same principle, December 27, B.C. 588, was a Tuesday—and, therefore, December 27, B.C. 590, was a Saturday. The siege of Jerusalem then was begun on the Jewish sabbath; and it has been shewn^x that it ended on the same. For the ninth of the fourth month, (when Zedekiah attempted to escape by night from the city,) if the premises on which I founded that conclusion were correct, was demonstrated to have been a sabbath. B.C. 588, if Nisan 14 coincided with April 17, and April 17 with Sunday; Thamuz 9 coincided with July 9; and July 9 with Saturday*.

* It is possible indeed that the tenth of Tebeth, B.C. 590, might coincide with December 28: in which case, while the siege would expire on the Saturday as before, it would begin on the Sunday; a cir-

cumstance of agreement, which would bring the analogy between the first siege under Nebuchadnezzar, and the last under Titus, to a degree of correspondence truly remarkable.

x Vol. i. 418. Dissertation xii.

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART I.

General prospective survey of the ministry of our Lord in Judæa.

THE entire history of our Lord's public ministry is divisible into that part of it which was discharged in Judæa, and that which was confined to Galilee: and these parts were not only distinct in themselves, beginning at different times and proceeding subsequently at different times, independent of each other, but are recorded in distinct and independent Gospels. The ministry in Judæa began before the ministry in Galilee; and the history of the ministry in Judæa is confined almost totally to St. John: the history of the ministry in Galilee is restricted almost as exclusively to the other three evangelists. A general and prospective survey of our Saviour's public ministry must regard it in each of its parts: and as that part which relates to Judæa was both prior to, and ever after distinct from that which belonged to Galilee, the survey will properly begin with and make an end of the former, before it passes to the latter.

The times and occasions of the ministry in Judæa are likewise twofold; the times and occasions when our Saviour was visiting Jerusalem, and the times and occasions when he was residing elsewhere in Judæa. The first instance on record of any attendance at Jerusalem is the visit at the Passover, John ii. 13; which has been fully considered already^a: and the first instance of any residence in Judæa, apart from Jeru-

^a Supra, Dissertation xxi.

saalem, is that which begins to be recorded, John iii. 22. and is supposed to continue, or go on still to the time of the return into Galilee, iv. 1, 2, 3; which also has been discussed in the preceding Dissertation. Of any instances of attendance at Jerusalem, posterior to the first, I shall speak by and by; but of any similar residence in Judæa, out of Jerusalem, the only other instance, distinct from the first, is that which is specified at John xi. 54: for though Ephraim might border upon Samaria, it was notwithstanding a city of Judæa. The length of this residence, as well as the period in the course of our Lord's ministry to which it belongs, will require to be considered hereafter; and may therefore for the present be deferred.

Besides these two instances, however, there is none other on record, either in St. John's Gospel or out of it, during which there is any reason to suppose that our Saviour was residing in Judæa: for as to Bethabara, supposing that to be the locality implied at John x. 40. as the scene of a temporary residence, it is proved, by a comparison with other passages^b, to have been situated in Peræa; and we may take it for granted it was either in Peræa, or at least in Galilee. Now each of these occasions stands entirely independent of the remainder of the course of our Lord's ministry; the former, as of very early occurrence in his first year; and the latter, as of very late in his third: and they are the only occasions, on which, as we shall better perceive hereafter, from the course of his ministry in general, an opportunity could have been given for the occurrence of any such residence in Judæa; and consequently, *a priori*, there could have been reason to suspect one. I take it for granted then that, excepting these two occasions in particular, our Lord was never resident in

^b i. 28. iii. 23. 25. 26.

Judæa, either for a longer, or for a shorter time, in the whole course of his ministry.

With regard in the next place to the times and occasions of the attendances at Jerusalem, these were, in every instance, the times and occasions of an attendance at some of the feasts: and there are *five* such instances actually on record; two, of attendances at a Passover^c; one, of an attendance at a feast of Tabernacles^d; one, of an attendance at a feast of Dedication^e; and one, which is left indefinite^f: but besides these there are no more. The occasion of each of these visits is so far exactly determined; and as to what period, in the course of our Lord's ministry generally, they are each to be referred to, that will appear in due time hereafter. The only question, which seems to require our consideration at present, is this; Whether the *five* instances, thus recorded, embrace *all* the instances of our Saviour's attendance in Jerusalem, at any of the feasts? or whether there is reason to suppose that he ever went up to Jerusalem, in the course of his ministry, at times and on occasions, distinct from these, and not recorded by St. John? The affirmative upon the former question, and the negative upon the latter, appear to me to be the truth.

For first, the Gospel of St. John is supplementary to the rest not only in general, and even where they all relate to transactions in Galilee, or elsewhere out of Judæa; but especially with respect to the transactions in Judæa. It was in this department of the Gospel history, that the preceding accounts were principally, or rather totally defective; since, with the exception of the history of passion-week, that is, of seven or eight days before the close of our Lord's public ministry, it is a notorious fact that they no

^c ii. 13. xii. 1.^d vii. 2—10.^e x. 22. 23.^f v. 1.

where speak of any visit to Jerusalem ; they no where, except by implication, prove our Lord to have been in Judæa at all. The reverse of this is true of St. John ; the scene of whose accounts, with the same exception of a very little transacted in Galilee, or on the other side of the lake of Tiberias, is uniformly placed in Judæa. The entire history of our Lord's ministry in this country has thus been left to be collected from St. John. It is reasonable therefore to presume that he has furnished the data necessary for that purpose ; and if so, that the instances of attendance at Jerusalem, which he has specified, are actually all which occurred. These visits of our Lord to that city were cardinal points in the discharge of his ministry in Judæa ; the incidents which then transpired were always of a peculiar kind, and eminently deserving of record. They prove not merely the fact of our Lord's compliance with the legal requisitions, which enjoined attendance at stated times on all the male Israelites ; but what was still more to be expected from him, his anxiety to convince the Jews, strictly so called—his brethren according to the flesh—of the truth of his character both by his discourses and by his miracles on the spot. Add to which, that at periods of time, distinct from these when St. John's Gospel demonstrates our Lord to have been present in Jerusalem, there are intimations in it, that he was either engaged elsewhere, or purposely absenting himself from Judæa ; and that, from a comparison of the other accounts with St. John's, it is almost certainly to be inferred that he must have been engaged at such times elsewhere ; he could not possibly have been in Judæa. All this is presumptively in favour of the general conclusion that, except on those occasions when St. John records the fact of his presence in Jerusalem, our Saviour was never there.

Secondly, the same conclusion will be still further confirmed, if it can be shewn that our Lord was under no absolute necessity of attending upon *all* the legal solemnities ; for then, we shall be free to suppose that, for prudential reasons, or for any other adequate consideration, he might sometimes omit to attend them. And this assumption will be proved to a demonstration, if it can be made out that there was an integral period in the duration of his ministry, in which there must have been *many* instances of the recurrence of stated legal solemnities, and yet there is *no* instance of our Lord's attendance at Jerusalem, upon any of them : in proof of which conclusion we may reason as follows.

The last instance of our Lord's attendance at Jerusalem, before the close of his ministry in public, is the visit at the Passover, John xii. 1 ; the fact of which, as it is needless to observe, is attested by the other evangelists as well as by St. John. The attendance immediately before that was the visit at the Encænia^g; and that this was the Encænia belonging to the same year of our Lord's ministry as the Passover recorded next after it, if it requires any proof, may be shewn as follows.

The departure from Jerusalem at this feast was premature, and occasioned by the renewed attempt on our Lord's life^h. He retired at that time to Bethabaraⁱ; and at Bethabara, he received the message of the sisters of Lazarus^k. Two days after that message he returned to Judæa^l; and this return could not have been long after the recent attempt on his life^m. The raising of Lazarus then followed soon after the Encænia; and this raising itself was the cause of a speedy departure

^g x. 22.^h Ib. 39.ⁱ Ib. 40.^k xi. 3.^l Ib. 6, 7.^m Ib. 8. 16.

from Jerusalem again ⁿ. The retreat to Ephraim therefore was also soon after the Encænia. From Ephraim, as I shall shew elsewhere, our Lord returned into Galilee, to begin that very circuit, the last event of which was the arrival at Bethany, six days before the Passover.

There can be no question, therefore, that the Encænia, John x. 22, was the feast of that name directly preceding the Passover, xii. 1. It is as little to be doubted that the same Encænia was the feast so called, immediately subsequent to the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2: that is, that the attendance at the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 10, was an instance of attendance directly prior, in the order of time, to the visit at the Encænia, x. 22. The very conversation which is recorded, x. 22—39, as the whole of the particulars which transpired on this visit; exhibiting so clear and so decided a reference to the first half of the same chapter ^o; (which belongs, as I shall shew more fully in its proper place, to the attendance at the feast of Tabernacles;) must be sufficient to prove that. The feast of Tabernacles in question, as well as the Encænia and the Passover before considered, are consequently all to be comprehended within the last six months of our Saviour's ministry; and beginning with the first of these, we possess clear proof that he attended them all in their order. Let us observe however what is the case with any feasts anterior to these; or with any attendance on an earlier occasion than any part of the last six months in question.

I. The remonstrance of our Lord's brethren with him, just before the feast of Tabernacles ^p, is plainly to be ascribed to the fact, that they knew him to have been absent from Judæa, and from Jerusalem in particular,

ⁿ xi. 54.^o 1—21.^p John vii. 2—9.

for some time past ; much longer than can be supposed intended by the ordinary interval between any two of the feasts, even those which were most remote from each other. The fact too that, when our Lord did go up to this feast, he went up to it not at its commencement, but at its middle ; not openly, but *ὥς ἐν κρυπτῷ* ; is sufficient proof that he had special reasons for avoiding publicity even on this occasion ; and therefore it is a presumptive argument that, for similar reasons, he might totally omit to attend on other occasions before it.

II. The uncertainty of the Jews, especially of the Jews of Jerusalem^q, before the actual appearance of Jesus, as to whether he would attend the feast or not ; is most naturally accounted for by supposing them aware that he had not been seen at any of the feasts for some time past. Nor is it any objection that a similar uncertainty is again expressed on a much later occasion^r, when it could not but be known that he had attended at the two feasts last past. There might still be the same kind of uncertainty about his attendance at *this* feast in particular, if experience had proved that it was not his custom to attend *every* feast in general ; nor could it be unknown that, on each of those occasions before, his life had been several times attempted ; and that an edict had been actually issued by the sanhedrim against him, leading in its consequences to the same result, which was ready at any time to be enforced.

III. Among the other circumstances which transpired at the feast of Tabernacles, our Saviour is represented^s as alluding to some past, but well known, event—and that, clearly, a miracle performed by himself—as the cause of all the hostility which had begun, and still continued to be entertained against him. Now, with regard to this miracle ; the matter of fact itself ; the

^q John vii. 11—13.

^r xi. 56.

^s vii. 21—23.

consequences ascribed to the fact; the parties addressed; the drift of the reasoning employed upon it; the circumstances before and after this point of time in the narrative: demonstrate it to be some individual, and specific, miracle; wrought upon the spot; wrought in the cure of an infirm person; wrought upon some sabbath day; and followed by a resolution, on the part of the Jews, grounded upon this fact more particularly, to take away the life of him who had performed it: all which criteria meet together in the history of the miracle recorded at John v. 1—16, as performed at the pool of Bethesda; performed on the man who had been thirty-eight years in his infirmity; performed on a sabbath, and followed by a special determination, on the part of the rulers of the Jews, for this supposed contempt of the sabbath, to effect the destruction of Jesus.

To this miracle then our Saviour was now referring: which being the case, if the miracle was performed at the time of the feast, v. 1, and is referred to for the first time, at the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2, one conclusion appears to me irresistible: This was the first time, since the performance of it, when there had been an opportunity of referring to it: our Lord and the people of Jerusalem had never met again, from that period until this when they met at the feast of Tabernacles. The context confirms the conclusion; for as it specifies no attendance at Jerusalem since the time of the feast, v. 1, so it can be understood to refer to none else *now*, that is at vii. 2. The reason of the thing alone is sufficient to convince us that, to a past transaction like this, and for the purpose of justifying himself on such a score as this, our Lord would revert with the *first* opportunity, which might occur, *after* the transaction itself; but not that he would often do

this, or be perpetually recurring to it: and consequently that it would be equally absurd to suppose either that he might frequently have been up to Jerusalem, and yet never have alluded to it until now; or that, as often as he had been up to Jerusalem before, so often had he alluded to it already. The discourse which followed at the time of the miracle, and is related from v. 17 to the end of the chapter, was not so much a justification of that one particular act which had preceded, as a general exposition of the proofs of our Saviour's divine legation; a general defence of his character; and a general expostulation with the unbelief of the Jews: and that specific resolution of putting him to death, produced by this particular act, though it might ultimately be resolvable into it, yet was not formed, or systematically acted on thenceforward, as a rule and principle to regulate the conduct of his enemies, until after his departure from Jerusalem. The very manner in which the evangelist records the formation of the resolution; καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον τὸν Ἰησοῦν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ: And therefore it was that the Jews began to persecute Jesus, and to seek to kill him, because he did these things on a sabbath day: implies as much.

The use we may make of the reference in question is consequently this; that our Lord had never been present in Jerusalem, attending upon any feast, between the time of the festival, John v. 1, and the time of the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2; a conclusion demonstratively certain of the feast of the Passover, vi. 4, which is one of the number; and that upon independent grounds: first, from the testimony of the other evangelists, each of whom records the first miracle of feeding, as well as St. John, and all of whom shew how our Lord was employed before and after it; se-

condly, from the declaration of St. John himself, vii. 1, that, After these things (meaning the discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum, only a day or two later than the miracle, and consequently also before the Passover) Jesus walked in Galilee; for he would not walk in Judæa, because the Jews were seeking to kill him.

Now, between the Passover, John vi. 4, and the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2, there was an interval of six months at least, during which our Lord could not have been in Jerusalem; and if the feast, referred to at v. 1, was a Passover also, between that and the Passover, vi. 4, there was an interval of at least twelve months more: so that for eighteen months, at least, between the feast, John v. 1, and the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2; (during which there were *five* different legal solemnities, viz. the Pentecost, Tabernacles, and Encænia of the first *twelve* months, and the Passover, and Pentecost of the last *six*;) our Lord could not once have been up to Jerusalem. It will be said however that this conclusion depends on the assumption that the feast mentioned, John v. 1, is a feast of the Passover; and not any other feast: the truth of which assumption may be established with an high degree of probability as follows:

I. The absence of the Greek article in speaking of this feast, unless its presence would infallibly have denoted the Passover, proves nothing at all; but leaves the question as undecided as before. The truth is that, as the Jewish calendar contained at least three feasts, all of equal antiquity and of equal authority, the article could not stand *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* before one, any more than before the rest, unless that one had come, in the lapse of time, to be placed for some reason or other at the head of the rest: a circumstance of distinction which,

as it will be shewn elsewhere ^t from Josephus and from other authorities; (all of whom St. John's expression, directly after—*ἦν δὲ ἐγγυὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἡ σκηνοπηγία*—contributes critically to confirm;) might hold good of the feast of Tabernacles, but would not of the feast of the Passover.

II. If the feast, John v. 1, was not the next Passover to ii. 13, the Passover, vi. 4, must have been so; and the feast, v. 1, must have been some feast between the two; and consequently some feast in the first year of our Saviour's ministry; *after* the Passover belonging to that year, but *before* the Passover at the beginning of the next: that is, it must have been either the Pentecost, or the feast of Tabernacles, or the Encænia comprehended within the first twelve months of his ministry. It could not have been the Pentecost; for, as I shewed in the last Dissertation, our Lord's return into Galilee out of Judæa, was just before the arrival of that feast. Nor could it have been the Encænia; for the Encænia fell out in the depth of winter, at which time no such assemblage of sick and infirm persons, as was supposed at the time of that feast, would be found about the pool of Bethesda. Nor could it have been the feast of Tabernacles; because at that feast of Tabernacles, and in the first year of his ministry, our Lord was engaged upon the circuit of Galilee: and it is a general argument why it could have been no feast in the first year of our Lord's ministry whatever, that, as I have in part observed already, the strain of the reflections, from v. 17, to the end, which were then delivered, is incompatible with such a supposition. The ministry of our Saviour, and consequently the trial of the Jews, must have been going on at least for one year, before the futurity of his rejection, and the consequent fact of their infidelity, could be so far cer-

^t Vide the Appendix.

tain, that they might admit of being argued with, as we find them to be on this occasion.

III. There is, in each of the three former evangelists^u, an account of a miracle performed on the sabbath day, and in the presence of our Lord's enemies, which was followed by a specific design, on their part, to put its author to death. There is also, in each of these Gospels, immediately before this account, an instance of another supposed breach of the sabbath; which, though it is not said to have been succeeded by the same resolution, is seen to have been followed by the same kind of offence, and at the commission of the same kind of crime, which afterwards produced that. It is manifest then that, at this particular juncture, the Scribes and Pharisees had made up their minds not merely to reject our Lord, but also on this one account; viz. the systematic contempt and breach, as they construed this part of his conduct, of one of their most sacred laws, the obligation of the sabbatic rest; and actuated by this feeling, that they were not only watching his actions, and putting the most sinister interpretation upon them, but were prepared, with the first favourable opportunity, to go even to the length of effecting his death. Their present conduct is the more remarkable, because the very first miracle which any one of these evangelists relates—the miracle performed on the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum^v; as well as another wrought the same day, in the cure of Peter's wife's mother: were both performed upon the sabbath; the former, publicly, and the latter, not in secret; yet they were both performed without any such effect. It took some time then either to convince our Lord's enemies of his non-observance, in this respect, of their traditional law, or to confirm

^u Matt. xii. 9—14. Mark iii. 1—6. Luke vi. 6—11.
28. Luke iv. 31—37.

^v Mark i. 21—

them in their unbelief; so as to except against this circumstance of his conduct particularly. This instance therefore may be justly considered not merely the earliest instance of any such exception, on record in the first three Gospels, but also the earliest which could be found there; the earliest, which it came within their plan to have recorded, until they noticed the present. It is an instance consequently perfectly distinct from John v. 1—16, not simply as taking place in a different locality; that is, somewhere in Galilee, and certainly not in Jerusalem; but also as occurring at a different juncture of time: and, therefore, since that in St. John was the first instance of its kind, this in the other evangelists was later than it: in which case, how aptly, and yet how critically, the former comes in to prepare for and illustrate the latter, is too obvious to require any proof.

Now in St. Luke's account of the transaction immediately prior to this, which was the walking through the corn-fields on the sabbath day^w, a term is employed to designate the sabbath in question, which, as it will be shewn hereafter, was intended to denote the *first regular* sabbath after the sixteenth of the Jewish Nisan, in that year; and consequently either in, or directly after the Paschal week. Either in, or directly after this week, then, our Saviour was travelling *on* a sabbath; and he performed the ensuing miracle, as I shall also shew with a degree of probability amounting almost to a certainty, in the neighbourhood of the lake of Galilee, and perhaps at Capernaum—and on the next sabbath, or on the next but one; which miracle was followed on that account by the design against his life.

What then is a more obvious conclusion than that, at the former of these times, Jesus had been up to Je-

^w Ch. vi. 1—5.

rusalem; and at the latter was got back to Capernaum? If so, we have evidence at Luke vi. 1, of an attendance at a Passover, which the course of events from that time forward in the same evangelist; (as well as in St. Matthew and in St. Mark;) compared with St. John, proves to be at least one year before the Passover, John vi. 4, when the miracle of feeding took place. No reasonable person then will hesitate to conclude, that the attendance at Jerusalem, John v. 1, which must have been prior to the Passover, vi. 4, as well as to the miracle, Luke vi. 6—11, must have been the attendance at that Passover itself: the account of which, if we admit the fact of it, St. Luke and his predecessors had manifestly omitted; and the circumstances of which, notwithstanding this omission, were necessary to explain both Luke vi. 1—5, and vi. 6—11, which they do all three record. These are coincidences which in my opinion do as plainly and strongly determine the time and occasion of the visit to Jerusalem, at John v. 1, to be the time and occasion of an attendance at the second Passover, as if the statement of that fact were *totidem verbis* premised to the account*.

* Among the arguments intended to prove that the feast, indefinitely mentioned John v. 1, could not be a Passover, none perhaps is more confidently put forward, and none is in reality more weak and inconclusive, than the following; viz. that the events, which are recorded in the fifth chapter of St. John, are not sufficient to occupy a year; and another Passover is mentioned directly after at vi. 4. It would be strange indeed to suppose them intended to occupy a year; since it must be self-evident that very possibly

they did not occupy the whole of a single day. But this argument proceeds upon the supposition that St. John's Gospel is entire and complete in itself; and that it neither has, nor was intended to have any supplemental relation to the rest: a supposition, which is purely precarious, and not more precarious than contrary to the matter of fact. The truth of the supplemental relation of this one Gospel in particular, is amongst the few positions, which happily do not admit of a question; and while that is the case, we are not

We may conclude then, with as much certainty as the nature of the case admits of, that for the whole of *eighteen* months, before the last feast of Tabernacles, our Lord had never been present at Jerusalem; and with regard to any attendance there, between the commencement of that period and the time of the Passover, John ii. 13, the conclusion, thus established, demonstrates of itself that he was under no necessity of attending; and therefore might not attend. Prudential reasons chiefly seem to have produced his absence after the Passover, John v. 1, and from that time forward; but any adequate motive, such as the commencement and prosecution of his ministry exclusively in Galilee, might produce the same effect before. The feast of Pentecost, in the first year of his ministry, is certainly out of the question; and enough has been said to render it probable that both the feast of Tabernacles and the Encænïa in the same year must be excepted likewise. I shall therefore make an end of this review of the ministry in Judæa, with one or two observations more, by way of corollary.

I. We have confirmed the presumption, otherwise established as it was, of the regular order, and the

bound to answer the question whether St. John's Gospel, *per se*, between v. 1, and vi. 4, supplies matters sufficient to occupy a year, but whether St. Matthew's, St. Mark's, and St. Luke's, in that portion of these Gospels respectively, the true place of which is between those extremes in St. John's, can presumptively be shewn to do so. And upon this point there is so little room for doubt, that the affirmative may be confidently asserted. The interval in question between

John v. 1, and John vi. 4, is in fact our Lord's second year; and with respect to *that* year, as it was the fullest of incident itself, so its incidents have been the most minutely related of any. From its beginning, by the attendance at this Passover, to its ending by the miracle of the five thousand, there is no part of it which was unemployed; nor the nature of the employment of which it is not possible clearly to ascertain.

supplementary relation, of St. John's Gospel; for we have shewn that, as he proposed to fill up the omissions of the other evangelists in general, so he has actually filled them up, where they most stood in need of supplements; viz. in the history of the ministry in Judæa, in particular.

II. We have discovered, in the several gospel histories laid together, satisfactory proofs of *four* distinct Passovers, which must have been consecutive at least; the Passover, John ii. 13; the Passover, John v. 1; the Passover, John vi. 4; and the Passover, John xii. 1: and if these were consecutive in a direct order, (as no one, who believes them to be distinct, can reasonably think of disputing,) they make up a period of three years in all. Our Lord's ministry began at the first, and ended at the last: it continued therefore three years between.

III. It is a remarkable fact, that after so long and systematic an absence from Jerusalem, as eighteen months before the feast of Tabernacles, John vii. 2, our Lord attended every feast, for the next six months, in its order. These attendances come in, it is true, to supply an entire, or at least a partial blank, for the same length of time, in the other Gospels. But what is also remarkable, these six months are the *last* six months of his ministry; beginning at the feast of Tabernacles and expiring at the feast of the Passover: which being the case, the reason of the fact must be sought for in the moral of the parable of the barren fig-tree^x; and will from that be found to be due to some necessity, more especially incumbent on our Saviour for the concluding period of his ministry, to be diligent both *in* Judæa and *out* of Judæa, with a view either finally to convince the Jews, and bring about the national repent-

^x Luke xiii. 6—9.

tance and conversion ; or at least to leave them without excuse to the ultimate consequences of an invincible unbelief.

IV. As *three*, out of the *five* feasts which our Lord actually attended, were feasts of the Passover, this circumstance proves how much more important in his estimation was his attendance at the Passover, than at any other feast ; and consequently how much closer a connection there was between the facts of his history and the purpose for which he came into the world, and the Passover, than any other feast.

V. It is also remarkable that, whereas the name of every other principal feast in the Jewish year, occurs in the Gospels, and the attendance of our Lord, once at least in the course of his ministry, at every other feast, is specified in the Gospels ; the feast of Pentecost is not even mentioned, much less said to have been attended in person by him. I consider this a proof, in the first place, that his ministry out of Judæa began, as we have supposed, at the time of this feast ; and was every year renewed with increased activity at the time of this feast : and secondly, that the peculiar events, which in all probability occurred—one in each year—about the period of this feast ; the call of the Apostles as disciples first ; their ordination as Apostles afterwards ; and our Lord's Transfiguration ; bore a concealed reference to something beyond themselves, and to the facts of the future Christian history. For it has been shewn elsewhere^y, that the time of the feast of Pentecost, from the first effusion of the Holy Ghost, to the mission of St. Paul among the Gentiles, was the great and cardinal point, through a period of fourteen years, in every step towards the more full and complete promulgation of the Gospel.

^y Vide Dissertation xv.

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART II.

General prospective survey of the ministry of our Lord in Galilee, year the first.

THE history of the ministry of our Lord out of Judæa is almost entirely the history of his ministry in Galilee; and for this we are as exclusively indebted to the first three evangelists, as for the history of the ministry in Judæa to the fourth.

The formal commencement of this ministry is placed by them all^a with the return into Galilee, posterior to the imprisonment of the Baptist; the coincidence of which with the return, mentioned in the fourth chapter of St. John^b, has been shewn in the twenty-first Dissertation. The time of the return, as it has also been shewn, was very probably not earlier, though it might be somewhat later, than the fourteenth day before the feast of Pentecost, U. C. 780, or May 16: to which day we considered it necessary, for the reasons there alleged, to assign the imprisonment of the Baptist. If the ministry in Galilee then was begun after that return, it was begun about the period of the feast of Pentecost in general; and the exact time of its commencement in particular is specified by St. Matthew: ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν^c: where the note of time, ἀπὸ τότε, is to be referred to verse thirteenth before; which speaks of our Lord's taking up his abode at Capernaum. It was so long consequently after the actual return into Galilee, as sufficed to bring

^a Matt. iv. 12. Mark i. 14. Luke iv. 14.

^b John iv. 1. 3. 43.

^c Ch. iv. 17.

him to Capernaum, in order to take up his residence there; but not longer.

Now the first transaction, posterior to this return, as we saw from St. John, was the performance of the miracle *in Cana upon* an inhabitant of Capernaum; the next, as it appeared from St. Luke, was the visit to Nazareth; and the last upon record, as it appears from the same Gospel^e, was the coming to Capernaum, preparatory to settling there. That these events were consecutive upon each other, and in the above order, there can be little question; and the description attached to the name of Capernaum, as a city of Galilee, (a description which occurs here, for the first time and for the last, in St. Luke,) is sufficient to prove that the period of the visit to Capernaum, in that Evangelist, is the same with that of the similar visit in St. Matthew^f; in other words, that Matt. iv. 13, and Luke iv. 31, are coincident in point of time. It would not follow, however, that the leaving of Nazareth, which is also mentioned in the former as previous to the settling in Capernaum, has any connection either directly or virtually with the close of the incident in the latter^g. The words imply no more than that whereas, before the return into Galilee, Nazareth had been our Saviour's home, so after it, and from that time forward, Capernaum became so in its stead.

The notice therefore, which is found in St. Luke^h prior even to the visit to Nazareth, is partly the account of an effect which had been already produced, and partly proleptical, or in reference to what was thenceforward about to take place. The fame of Jesus had actually been diffused through Galilee even before this return, by the miracles which he was known to have performed at the preceding Passoverⁱ; and it

^e iv. 31.

^f iv. 13.

^g iv. 16—30.

^h iv. 14, 15.

ⁱ John iv. 45.

would be still more generally disseminated by the miracle at Cana: the report of which is seen to have reached Nazareth before he arrived there. The visit to Nazareth, and the discourse which ensued in the synagogue of that place, considered as a case in point, demonstrate both the truth of the assertion that our Lord began now to teach, and to teach in their synagogues; and also the reality of the effect ascribed to his teaching; viz. that he was glorified of all: for all who heard him in the synagogue at Nazareth are said^k to have borne witness unto him, and to have marvelled at the words of grace, which were proceeding out of his mouth. The declaration premised then is to be understood proleptically; of what thenceforward began to take place: not historically, or of what had already taken place. A visit indeed to Nazareth, and an instance of teaching confined to the synagogue of that place, could by no means come under the denomination of the commencement of our Lord's ministry on a large and comprehensive scale. Nor though St. Luke mentions here the fact of some teaching does he mention on the same occasion the fact of any preaching; nor indeed before the time when he shews our Lord to be actually engaging on the circuit of Galilee^l.

As to St. Mark^m, his declaration also is not inconsistent with the statement of St. Matthewⁿ; for it may be understood simply of the final end which was always proposed by the return into Galilee; viz. such a formal publication of the gospel of the kingdom, as is there asserted: or, as *he* says nothing, like St. Matthew, of the choice of Capernaum in preference to Nazareth, yet by the incident, which he proceeds to record^o, shews that our Lord was then either already there or near it; there is no reason why Mark i. 14, 15 should

^k iv. 22.^l iv. 43, 44.^m i. 14, 15.ⁿ iv. 13—17.^o i. 16.

not be considered to harmonize exactly with Matthew iv. 17: nor why each of them should not be supposed to relate to the same point of time.

Before therefore we can properly enter on the survey of our Lord's ministry in Galilee henceforward; there are two things which deserve some notice, because they were preliminary, or at least prior even to its commencement: first, the propriety of the choice of Capernaum, as the place of his stated abode; and secondly, the propriety of the time, viz. the period of the feast of Pentecost, at which we suppose his ministry in this country to have begun.

First, the necessity of some fixed place of abode for our Saviour must be obvious. He could not always be in motion, or engaged upon his circuits. There must be periods in the course of the entire duration of his ministry, of greater or of less extent, for which, upon various accounts, he would be stationary; and if he were stationary on some definite locality, the great business of his ministry would much better be promoted, than if otherwise. The resort of the multitudes from all parts, for the sake of his miracles or of his instructions, even when he was not himself professedly employed in dispensing both to them at their own homes, could not be more encouraged or more facilitated than by their knowing that, though not present among them in person, he might still be found in one place. It is as little to be questioned both from this passage of St. Matthew, compared with another^p, and with the parallel accounts of St. Mark and of St. Luke^q; and from the allusion, twice repeated^r, to some peculiar honour and distinction, as conferred upon Capernaum above every other city of Galilee; (which is best explained

^p ix. 1.
Luke x. 15.

^q Mark v. 21. Luke viii. 40.

^r Matt. xi. 23, 24.

by considering *that* the place of our Saviour's residence, as the *rest* were of his temporary visits;) that Capernaum was selected for the purpose. Nor was there any other city which we should consider *a priori* likely to be so chosen, except Nazareth, the place of his infancy and his education, and probably the birthplace also of most of his relations.

It is some confirmation of this latter presumption, that the first instance of his beginning to teach publicly occurred in the synagogue of Nazareth. An opportunity for believing in him was thereby given to his countrymen; and given to them before any others: which preference it is reasonable that we should attribute to the natural and the amiable motive of regard on the part of our Lord, for the spiritual welfare of his fellow-townsmen in particular. What might have been the result of the experiment, had it succeeded according to his benevolent desire, it may not be possible to say; but the failure of this first trial, and the similar disappointment of a second, made at a later period in his ministry, demonstrate that the disposition of the people of Nazareth was rooted in unbelief: and it is equally certain, from the reproach of the *Nazarene*, so early and so permanently fixed upon our Lord himself, that the disposition of the rest of the Jews was as little in favour of Nazareth. The renunciation of our Lord's former place of abode, as the first step towards the discharge of his public ministry, might consequently be just as necessary in condescension to the prejudices of the people at large, as a natural effect of the rude and violent treatment which he himself met with there.

Among the causes, then, which produced the choice of Capernaum, the above may be reckoned as of some weight. Another might be, that there was one family

there, the family of the nobleman whose son had been recently restored to health; which was already prepared to receive and to acknowledge our Lord. Nor is it an improbable conjecture that this nobleman was Chuzas, the steward or fiscal procurator of the tetrarch of Galilee; whose wife Joanna is mentioned once amongst such as ministered to our Lord's wants upon his circuits of Galilee^s; and again amongst those who visited his tomb on the morning of the resurrection^t. A third reason, as specified by St. Matthew^u, was the accomplishment of prophecy^v; which having predicted that the land of Zebulun and of Naphtali, by the way of the sea; (that is, the *sea* of Galilee, concerning which Jerome, *in locum*^w, observes, *Mare autem hic lacum appellat Genesareth . . . in cujus littore Capharnaum, et Tiberias, et Bethsaida, et Chorozaïm* sitæ sunt*;) should be the principal scene of the Messiah's ministry, and the principal partakers of its benefits, required him to make choice of some place of residence, which was critically situated on the confines of both. Such would Capernaum be; for it lay at the north-western extremity of the lake. And, according to Josephus,—Ζαβουλωνίται δὲ τὴν μέχρι Γεννησαρίτιδος . . . ἔλαχον—τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἀνατολὰς τετραμμένα . . . καὶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας τὰ καθύπερθεν, Νεφθαλίται παρέλαβον^x.

A fourth reason, and specified also by St. Matthew, was its proximity to the lake; and the consequent facility which it afforded of avoiding the importunity or the pressure of the multitude, when either became inconveniently great, by teaching them from the sea,

* Chorazin, the city so named in the Gospels, seems to be the same which is mentioned, 1 Sam. xxx. 30, under the name of Chor-ashan.

^s Luke viii. 3. ^t xxiv. 10. ^u Matt. iv. 14—16. ^v Isaiah ix. 1, 2.
^w Operum iii. 83. *ad medium*. ^x Ant. v. i. 22.

and not on the land ; but especially for our Lord's conveying himself speedily away, when the excitement produced by his miracles was in danger of leading the people to some rash act ; or when the malice and scrutiny of his personal enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, were more pertinacious than usual ; tempting him with insidious questions, watching his actions with a sinister intent, or in consequence of some recent miracle, inflamed against him with more violence than ever : and rendering it only prudent to retire for a while from their immediate vicinity, or their observation.

It may be said indeed, that any city on the shore of the lake might answer these purposes as well as Capernaum. But it is to be remembered that Capernaum was also the native place, or at least the residence, of the four chief of the apostles, Peter and Andrew, James and John ; and perhaps of more among them, as of Matthew, and possibly of Philip : whose convenience might be consulted in fixing on this in preference to any other place. Besides, if any one will inspect the maps of Palestine, he will see that it lay as nearly as possible in the midst of the four principal divisions of that country ; Peræa, Decapolis, Trachonitis, on the east and the north ; the two Galilees, and Samaria, on the west ; and Judæa Proper, on the south : and, consequently, was equally favourable for the resort of the people to our Lord from all those parts alike. It was as conveniently situated also, for the beginning and the conclusion of general progresses or circuits of Galilee, as any which could be selected ; and its distance from Tiberias, one of the seats of the tetrarchal government, which was almost as great as possible, the one lying at the upper, and the other towards the lower extremity of the same lake ; might

be some motive for choosing it rather than any other city on the lake.

Besides, as Galilee was amongst the most populous regions of Palestine, so was the land of Gennesaret, the capital of which may be considered as Capernaum, one of the most fertile, and most populous parts of Galilee; as Josephus bears witness in the following passage.

A region, of the same name, extends along the lake of Gennesar, the natural beauty of which is admirable. For such is the fertility of the soil, that it rejects no kind of plant; and they, who cultivate it, have left no sort unplanted there: and such is the temperature of the climate, that it suits the most different wants of nature. In addition to palm-trees, which thrive best by heat, and figs and olives in their vicinity, which require a milder air; nut-trees, the hardiest of plants, flourish there in the utmost abundance. It might be said that nature had been purposely ambitious of forcing herself to collect upon one spot discordant principles; and that the seasons, with a salutary conflict, each as it were challenged exclusively the possession of the country: for not merely does it so unaccountably nourish the different productions of as many different periods of the year, but it also preserves what it nourishes. The noblest of the kind, such as grapes and figs, it supplies for ten months without ceasing: and fruits of every other description, growing old on the trees round about, are supplied for the whole year. For besides the temperature of the air, it is watered by a very fertilizing spring, which the natives call Capharnaum . . . In length, the region extends along the lake, which is called by the same name, as far as thirty stades; and in breadth, as far as twenty^y.

To these reasons others, if they were necessary, might be added; but as these may suffice, I shall over and above observe only, that the selection of Capernaum, as a fixed place of residence, is no proof that our Lord possessed any house of his own therein; nor consequently of any inconsistency with that moving and pathetic declaration of his, twice repeated^z, *The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay down his head.* The first instance of his using any house in Capernaum was in the use made of the house of Simon and Andrew^a. There is proof after that of his being entertained in the house of Levi, or Matthew also^b: but there is no proof of his ever living in an house of his own, or in what may not justly be considered as only the house of some friend or of some disciple. The visit to Capernaum, in St. John^c, was clearly a passing visit; and though after a certain time, our Lord's mother and his brethren are both spoken of apparently as resident in Capernaum^d, yet even they had no house of their own, or none in which our Lord was living along with them. That he was regarded however legally as an inhabitant of Capernaum, is indisputably proved by the incident relating to the tribute money^e.

Secondly; if our Saviour's ministry began about the feast of Pentecost, the proceedings in the synagogue at Nazareth, related by St. Luke, could not be much prior to the same time. The passage, recited from Isaiah^f, may be said to militate against that fact; for that passage is part of the Haphtoroth, or portion of scripture, appointed for the daily service of a much later period of the year; viz. after the feast of Taber-

^z Matt. viii. 20. Luke ix. 58.
^a Matt. viii. 14. Mark i. 29. Luke iv. 38.
^b Mark ii. 15. Luke v. 29.
^c ii. 12.
^d Matt. xii. 46. Mark iii. 21.
^e Matt. xvii. 24.
^f Isaiah lxi. 1, 2.

nacles itself. Admitting however that the passage is part of some such section, still we may contend that this objection is taken from the order of the Jewish lessons, as they *now* stand; which order can never be demonstratively shewn to be the order in which they *always* stood; or the order in which they stood in our Saviour's time. The ground of such an objection therefore is much too precarious to overturn every other argument which, from a variety of considerations, both may be, and has been urged to a contrary effect. There is no authentic instance supplied by the New Testament, distinct from this, of a passage recited either from the Law or from the Prophets; which might be compared with it, and with the arrangement of the Jewish lessons at present. If however that part of scripture, which the eunuch was reading to himself when Philip was commanded to join him^g, was part of the lesson for the day; that passage was taken from the fifty-third of Isaiah, and the time when the eunuch was reading it, was soon after the feast of Pentecost^h. The sixty-first of Isaiah, therefore, could not well be in course *before* the feast of Pentecost, if the fifty-third was so *after* it; and if either of them was in course then, neither could well be so at the feast of Tabernacles, more than four months later.

This leads me to observe, that the proceedings at Nazareth on the occasion in question, at least with respect to our Saviour's conduct, though produced and justified by the special reasons of the case, were yet entirely out of course. He was preparing shortly to commence his ministry; and he prepares to commence it by citing an illustrious prophecy, applicable solely to himself, but as the Messiah of Israel, and as the Saviour of mankind. There is no one particular in

^g Acts viii. 32.

^h Supra, 30, 31. Dissertation xv.

that enumeration of the various offices to which he declared himself anointed, that is, ordained and commissioned, which must not be understood in a spiritual sense; there is none which, without an absurdity, can be literally received and construed. And they are spiritual purposes and spiritual benefits, which, though they might be notified or proclaimed in the lifetime of Christ, could be verified only after his death. The reference also to the Spirit of God, as the efficient cause of the unction by which the Christ had become consecrated to one and all of these functions; is more apposite *a priori*, to the supposition of the feast of Pentecost, than of any other period: for that was a time which the previous history of the Jews in the dispensation of the Law, and the subsequent history of Christianity in the dispensation of the Gospel, shewed to have been especially, and κατ' ἐξοχὴν, appropriated to the agency of the Spirit. The exordium of the prophecy ought to be rendered thus: The Spirit of the Lord is upon me for the purpose whereunto he hath anointed me. He hath sent me to preach the gospel to the poor: and the rest.

It is said indeed that, when he stood up to read, the book of Isaiah was put into his hands; but unless it can be shewn that every separate book of the Old Testament was contained in a separate roll, and not the whole, or many parts of the whole, in one; which is still the case with the most ancient manuscripts both Hebrew and Greek; this circumstance proves nothing upon the point at issue: the offering of the book of Isaiah implies no more than the offering to our Lord the volume of the scriptures in general, or the volume of the prophets in particular*. Be this however as

* Theodorit, Operum i. 860. εἰρήκασιν Ἀκύλας, καὶ Σύμμαχος.
Ps. xxxix. 8: τὴν κεφαλίδαν εἶλημα οὕτω δὲ τὰς θείας γραφὰς μέχρη καὶ

it may, the volume, it is certain, was put into his hands closed or rolled up; for he had to unfold it for himself: and it is manifest that he unfolded or opened it expressly to find out the passage in question. Whether then the preliminary act of delivering him the book of Isaiah was regular or irregular, his finding out and reciting aloud the first part of the sixty-first chapter was clearly his own doing; and is obviously to be accounted for by the appositeness of the passage recited to the time and occasion of the formal commencement of his ministry. It is evident, also, that as he rolled up the book and gave it back again to the minister, after he had read this verse, and no more; he always intended to read only this verse, and no more: but it would be absurd to suppose that this verse only and no more was the proper lesson for the day; the different sections as they now stand being generally of much greater length than our own divisions into chapters, which are intended for the same purpose: in which case, it may well be questioned whether he was reading any part of the lesson for the day at all.

Nor can it be said that, perhaps, he was doing no more than what on such occasions might usually be done; viz. first reciting a verse, and then proceeding to expound it; for it would be false to say that any exposition, even of this verse, is actually subjoined: and it must be evident from his closing the book and returning it to the servant, to be restored to its place, that when he had recited this one verse, he had done with the passage; he meant to recite no more. The

τήμερον Ἰουδαῖοι κατασκευάζειν εἰώ-
θασιν—iii. 695. In 2 Tim. iv. 13 :
μεμβράνας τὰ εἰλητὰ κέκληκεν· οὕτω
γὰρ Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσι τὰ δέρματα.
ἐν εἰλητοῖς δὲ εἶχον πάλαι τὰς θείας
γραφάς· οὕτω δὲ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρ-

όντος ἔχουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. Cf.
Œcumenius in 2 ad Tim. iv. 13 :
ii. 280. D. Also Arethas, in
Revel. vi. 14. apud Œcumenium,
ii. 710. B. and Suidas, Κεφαλὴς
βιβλίου.

circumstance mentioned immediately after, viz. that when he had done each of these things and was set down, but before he had yet added a word, the eyes of all in the synagogue were steadily fixed upon him; is an intimation that what he had just been doing was something novel and unexpected: the nature of such an exordium raised the anticipation of more of the like kind to follow it, and sharpened the attention of the observers. When therefore they heard him proceeding to apply the scripture directly to himself; though they wondered at the gracious words which issued from his mouth, yet the reflection immediately occurring, who it was that spoke them, the scandal produced by this reflection was too strong even for the natural impression which had preceded as the effect of the words themselves, and of the manner of him who delivered them.

To proceed: though the ministry of our Saviour, as far as concerned the assumption of the character of the Messiah, and his beginning to act in that character, had certainly commenced in Judæa, and so early as the last Passover; still he had never yet done that which is meant by preaching, or proclaiming, the gospel of the kingdom—and calling on all men, by repentance and amendment of life, to prepare for its manifestation: because John, who had been hitherto the proper instrument in the discharge of this commission, before the last return into Galilee was not yet cast into prison. The beginning, continuance, and final completion of such a ministry on the part of our Lord from this time forward; the mission of the Twelve, and of the Seventy, each in its proper order of time, and each agreeing in its final end and purpose respectively with the description of the ministry of our Lord at this very period, and of that of

the Baptist long before: demonstrate, as we argued at length elsewhere, an unity of design and of functions in the ministry of them all. The kingdom of heaven in each of these instances, as the subject of one and the same proclamation, was necessarily one and the same also; and being what the Baptist and the Messiah; what the Twelve and the Seventy; each in their proper order concurred to announce in common, and to announce as future; it can be understood of nothing which was to come to pass in the lifetime of Christ: it can be understood of nothing, therefore, but of the future dispensation of the gospel. The actual promulgation of the Christian religion, that is, the first open establishment of the kingdom of heaven, took place on the day of Pentecost; from which the actual dispensation of the gospel begins to be dated. With reason then might the first intimation of its futurity, the first public and authoritative declaration of the tidings of the kingdom, which proceeded from the mouth of our Lord himself, coincide with the same period also. Besides, the great business of our Lord as a moral teacher, while he continued among mankind, was to revive, reinforce, and enlarge the moral part of the ancient Law. The first sermon delivered from the mountain is alone sufficient to prove this. Hence, as the Law was originally given and instituted at this period of the year; and as the feast of Pentecost itself was appointed in commemoration of that event: we have in this fact an additional proof of the propriety with which the revival and republication of the Law, as made by the teaching of our Saviour, would coincide with the same period. Nothing could tend more directly, in the estimation of all observing and reflecting persons, to point him out as the original and independent Lawgiver, promised by Moses,

like unto himself; that is, as the great Prophet and Teacher who should come into the world; than such a coincidence.

These preliminary considerations being disposed of, we may observe that from the date of the formal commencement of our Saviour's ministry in Galilee, it admits of no other distribution than into the times and occasions when he was resident at Capernaum; the times and occasions when he was making the circuits of Galilee; and the times and occasions when, though doing neither of these things, he was yet, for special reasons, travelling in Galilee or elsewhere. His circuits themselves, though all undertaken for a common purpose, are still to be distinguished into such as were *general*, and extending to the whole of the country; and such as were *partial*, or confined to some portion of it. Subject to these limitations his ministry will now be considered; not so as every where to descend into particulars, but to be satisfied with the outline of things: and more especially with a view to determine, as accurately as either the general reasons of probability, or the special reasons of the case may allow, the times and the places belonging to each transaction of our Lord's ministry, through the several years of its duration: in order to which, we may premise that the earliest intimation of the commencement of the first year, though really upwards of five weeks later than its actual date, which occurs in the first three Gospels, is the return into Galilee, after the imprisonment of John: the earliest intimation of the beginning of the second is the walking through the corn-fields on the sabbath: and the earliest intimation of the arrival of the third is the question concerning eating with unwashen hands: all of them notices not merely of such integral periods in themselves, as the several years of the

ministry of Christ, but what is equally remarkable, supplied, each in the same relative order, by all the first three evangelists; or only in the last instance of all, and that for a reason which is easily to be assigned, omitted by St. Luke in particular. Some of the topics, which would thus have come within the scope of the present review, will be found to have been already anticipated; in which case, we must be allowed to refer to the results of former inquiries: and some will require to be discussed by themselves hereafter; in which case we must reserve their proper consideration for another opportunity.

If, then, our Lord, as we have conjectured^k, came into Galilee not before, nor yet possibly much later, than the thirty-sixth day from the sixteenth of Nisan; he came thither about fourteen days before the feast of Pentecost: and the first things done after the return, as we have also seen, were the visits to Cana, to Nazareth, and to Capernaum respectively; all which might follow upon the return and upon each other, within fourteen days' time. The visit to Nazareth was prior to a sabbath; and the visit to Capernaum was prior to a sabbath also: but still there is no reason why these sabbaths might not be successive ones; or why the teaching in the one place might not be only a week, or at the utmost a fortnight prior to the teaching in the other. Our Saviour might go down directly from Nazareth to Capernaum; (the distance between which was not more than one day's journey;) as soon as the expiration of the sabbath would permit him to do so: and after what had happened in Nazareth, it is not likely that he would make any longer stay there; and St. Luke, from the circumstance of his relating the two facts

^k *Supra*, Dissertation xxi.

in conjunction, may be considered to imply that he left Nazareth and went to Capernaum without delay.

The question, therefore, which we have still to propose here, is, whether the visit to Nazareth followed by the teaching there, and the visit to Capernaum followed by the teaching there also; supposing them to have been only one or two weeks asunder; were both prior or both posterior, or the one prior and the other posterior, to the day of Pentecost? I consider it most probable that the day of Pentecost fell out between the two; and consequently that the visit to Nazareth was prior to that day, but the visit to Capernaum, and the teaching there, were posterior to it. That this was a possible event may be shewn as follows.

The day of Pentecost, as being the fiftieth in order from the sixteenth of Nisan, reckoned inclusively; that is, being the first day of the eighth week, as that was of the first, between the Passover and Pentecost; necessarily fell on the same day of the week in every year as the sixteenth of Nisan: and U.C. 780, A. D. 27, in the first year of our Saviour's ministry, the sixteenth of Nisan coincided with April 11, and both with the first day of the week¹. The same thing therefore must have held good of the day of the ensuing Pentecost, May 30. Now it might be, even *a priori*, conjectured that one of the days, which were spent by our Saviour at Sychar^m, was very probably spent there because it coincided with a sabbath: and if he came there on the evening of the thirteenth of May, and departed thence again on the morning of the sixteenth, this was actually the case; for May 13, U.C. 780, was Thursday, and May 16 was Sunday.

Upon this supposition, Jesus would proceed to Cana

¹ Vol. i. 332. Dissertation v. and 406. Dissertation xii.

^m John iv. 40.

at the beginning of the week; and as we may suppose would arrive there also at the beginning of the same. The miracle on the sick person in Capernaum might be performed soon after his arrival: and it is some confirmation of this supposition, that the miracle, which was performed in Cana, could not have been performed either *on* the sabbath, or on the day *before* the sabbath at least; for the nobleman would neither have invited our Lord to come down to Capernaum upon the sabbath, nor have travelled back thither himself on that day.

It might therefore be performed on the third or the fourth day of the week; and yet the fact of the performance be already known in Nazareth, or in any place not more remote from Capernaum than Nazareth was, before the sixth or the seventh. In this case the sabbath, which was passed in Nazareth, might be the sabbath next but one before the day of Pentecost; viz. May 22: and that it was some sabbath either two or three days at least *before*, or two or three days at least after that *day*, though we had no other grounds for supposing so, might safely be concluded from the fact that the inhabitants of Nazareth, the male part of them especially, were still in the placeⁿ; that is, they were either not yet gone up to the feast, or they were already returned from it; to each of which effects, besides the one day taken up by the observance of the feast, two or three days' journey would be absolutely necessary.

At the same time after this visit, at which the people of Nazareth might be preparing to set out to Jerusalem, our Lord might depart to Capernaum: for though we cannot suppose that he also, like the rest of the people of Galilee, would return to Judæa, (which he

ⁿ Exod. xxiii. 14—17. xxxiv. 23. Deut. xvi. 16. Jos. Bell. Jud. ii. xix. 1.

had so recently left,) for the sake of attending the feast in common with them; yet neither can we suppose that, after what had just befallen him, he would stay much longer in Nazareth. The day of Pentecost then, May 30, would be spent by him in Galilee, and probably in Capernaum. The next sabbath day, after the day of Pentecost, June 5, would be the sabbath on which his ministry in that place was formally begun; and the first Sunday after the same date, June 6, is ascertained by the narrative itself as the very day on which he set out upon the first circuit of Galilee.

One week at least of his history, it is true, continues even on this supposition to be unaccounted for; but it is a week transacted in Capernaum, where the inactive periods of his ministry in general, by which I mean the intervals between his journeyings abroad, appear in other instances to have been transacted: and, if the day of Pentecost fell sometime within it, or at its very commencement, it would be a week of inaction not altogether unnecessary. For though our Lord himself might not go up to Jerusalem to the approaching feast, the rest of the nation would do so; by whose going and returning to their homes, which would be requisite before he could enter on his ministry among them, six or seven days would be taken up^o.

This point then being presumptively established; the first event posterior to the choice of Capernaum, distinctly on record, is the call of the four disciples, Simon and Andrew, James and John; the particulars of which are given by St. Matthew and by St. Mark^p, but, for reasons which will appear elsewhere, are

^o 1 Macc. x. 34. Jos. Ant. Jud. xiii. ii. 3.
i. 16—20.

^p Matt. iv. 18—22. Mark

omitted by St. Luke; who yet, by shewing at a subsequent point of time^q, that Simon, and others with Simon, his acquaintances, were already attached to, and already disciples of our Lord, recognizes implicitly the fact of their previous call. The scene of this transaction being laid by each of the evangelists in the neighbourhood of the lake of Tiberias; and the call being followed by the entering of all the parties together into Capernaum; we cannot doubt that the transaction took place in the vicinity of Capernaum. Capernaum was the residence, and probably the native place of Simon and Andrew, two out of the four; and it was the residence of James and John, the other two also; each of whom was a partner with the rest in the common occupation of fishermen. Now the call is related by St. Matthew after he had said that Jesus came to Capernaum, and settled there; which may be thought to imply that he had been some time, longer or shorter, at Capernaum before it: nor would this be at variance with St. Mark^r, unless the entering into Capernaum, there spoken of, after the call, were also affirmed by him to be the first instance of the kind since our Saviour came thither. It is a more critical assertion that they are said, immediately after, to have gone into the synagogue on the sabbath; for this implies that the call did not long precede the sabbath: and St. Luke, by making the beginning to teach in this same synagogue the very next thing apparently to the coming down to Capernaum, leads to the same inference^s.

Laying all these intimations together, we may conjecture that Jesus had been at Capernaum about a week before he began to teach, and that he called the four disciples the day before that event itself: a con-

^q iv. 38.^r i. 21.^s iv. 31.

jecture perfectly in unison with the conclusions already established ; and in fact borne out by them. The instance of teaching which followed, was the first instance of the kind which had yet occurred, as we may justly conclude, if for no other reason, at least for this ; viz. that both in St. Mark and in St. Luke, the specific observation upon the characteristic of our Lord's manner of teaching, that it was with authority, is found subjoined to this instance of teaching here, once for all : the nature of which argument I shall have occasion to explain more at large elsewhere.

The call of these disciples *now* is a proof that they had never been called *yet* ; the readiness, with which they obey the call even now is a proof that they were prepared to receive it before now : and such a preparation implies both a previous acquaintance with our Saviour, and a previous disposition to believe in him ; the fact and the reasons of which, though they do not appear from the accounts of the first three evangelists, are yet satisfactorily ascertained by St. John ^t.

For it is seen from his narrative, that all these four persons were either disciples of John the Baptist, or at least believers in his divine legation, before they acquired either of these relations to Jesus Christ. Two of them (Andrew, and as there is every reason to suppose, the evangelist St. John) are specified by name as such ; and as the other two were brothers of these respectively, and all four were connected by a common acquaintance with each other, and by a partnership of trade ; it is reasonable that we should conclude the same thing also of them. Simon, one of them, was present at Bethabara, as well as Andrew and John, attending on the Baptist ; and though James might not be there exactly at that time, he might still be a

^t Ch. i. 35. to the end.

disciple of the Baptist; or his name in particular may have been suppressed by the evangelist, on the same principle for which he omitted his own; because it was the name of his brother. Besides these four, Philip and Nathanael also must have been believers in John.

Now the act of the Baptist, by which he pointed out Jesus, as he was walking, to Andrew and John, under the emblem of the Lamb of God^u, who should take away, or rather should *carry* the sin of the world; (for on this point St. Chrysostom observes, οὐκ εἶπεν, ἔλυσεν, ἀλλ' ἔλαβεν καὶ ἐβάστασεν· ὁ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν μᾶλλον εἰρησθαί μοι δοκεῖ τῷ προφήτῃ συμφώνως Ἰωάννη τῷ λέγοντι· Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτιὰν τοῦ κόσμου^v;) was certainly designed to point him out to them as the Messiah: and so, as it is clear, they understood it^w: but that it was also designed to intimate that they must thenceforward cease to be his disciples, and become the disciples of Jesus, does not so clearly appear. They followed Jesus indeed in consequence of what John had said; but it was more out of curiosity than from any other motive: for on his turning and asking, What seek ye? it appears from their answer, that they wished merely to learn where he dwelt. He invited them to come and see; and they abode with him for the rest of that day: the mention of which circumstance, as such, distinctly implies that they continued with him at that time no longer than for that day; and the mention, at verse forty-fourth, of the day after proves equally that what had happened, and is related between^x, happened on that same day.

Now neither as they became acquainted with Jesus at first, nor in the course of what subsequently passed between them; is any thing seen to transpire which can be construed into a call *from* our Lord *to* them.

^u i. 36. 29.

^v Operum vii. 327. D. in Matthæum Homilia xxvii. i.

^w John i. 42.

^x i. 40—43.

The peculiar manner in which he apostrophizes Simon in particular—Thou art Simon, the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas; seems, on the contrary, expressly intended as if to prevent such a construction: for if these words conveyed a call of Simon, they conveyed also the name of Peter; but the name of Peter was neither given to him nor assumed by him, until a year at least from this time, when Simon was ordained an apostle. Simon therefore did not receive any call now. Hence, though these four disciples, or three of them at least might from this time forward have become believers in our Lord, as the Messiah; yet that they would attach themselves to him does by no means follow; or if they did so, it would be of their own accord.

It is true, that on the following day Jesus addressed to Philip the words which elsewhere are used to convey a call, ἀκολούθει μοι^y; but Philip was not one of the four; and if he had been, it would make no difference: for the context plainly demonstrates that this was no call to become a disciple, but merely an invitation to return with the speaker into Galilee. Nor is it probable that, whatever predisposition to believe in our Lord might have been raised in John's disciples by their Master's testimony, our Lord himself would formally call any in general, before he had actually commenced his ministry in any sense, either in Judæa or in Galilee; of which things he had yet done neither: nor that when he had commenced his ministry, he would formally call any in particular, prior to the four principal disciples, Simon and Andrew, James and John. I much question whether he himself in person ever called any to become disciples, except these four and St. Matthew; though he must in person have ordained all the Twelve to be apostles. But these four in par-

ticular, if he did not actually call until so long after, it must be evident that he never could have called so long before.

Yet our Lord, it will be said, was attended by disciples from this time forward, in his journeyings to and fro, before both the Passover, John ii. 13, and the return into Galilee, iv. 3. 43. There is no proof however, that these were disciples who had been called by him; or who had not attached themselves to him of their own accord; as some of them doubtless must have done to John before him. Besides, the word *μαθητῆς* is used in St. John indiscriminately for a simple believer in Jesus, as much as for one of his professed followers^z: so that the mere term itself proves nothing on the point at issue: and yet I am entirely disposed to allow that among those who are mentioned by this name, on the several occasions between John ii. 2, and v. 1, some may be included who afterwards became regular disciples, and even apostles; provided that we suppose they had yet received no call from our Lord in person, and were still held in attendance upon him solely by their own choice and their own act. In this case, there might be occasions when they would not be about him, but engaged on their own business elsewhere: and certain it is, that until he himself had formally entered on his own ministry, and they had as formally been called to attend upon him, they could not consider themselves in any sense bound to give up their ordinary occupations entirely, or to be constantly in his society. They did not, as we shall see hereafter, consider themselves bound to do this, even after they had both received such a call, and made a circuit of Galilee along with him; much less at any time before that.

^z iv. 1. vi. 66. vii. 3. viii. 31. ix. 27, 28. xviii. 19. xix. 38.

St. Peter, in a passage^a which has been recited elsewhere^b, defined the qualifications of the future apostle who was to succeed to the place of Judas, as those of one who had companied with them, since the time for which the Lord Jesus, having begun from the baptism of John to the day of his reception into heaven, went in, and went out among them: where, by the baptism of John, I shewed was meant the ministry of John; and by our Lord's beginning from that baptism, his beginning with the close of that ministry, and entering upon his own. The passage then virtually affirms that neither St. Peter, nor any of the rest, who were apostles at that very time, had received their call, or begun to company regularly with Jesus, before the same period; whereby it is exactly in unison with the testimony of the first three Gospels.

It is not improbable, that if Simon, Andrew, and John were originally disciples of the Baptist before they became acquainted with Jesus, they might continue so afterwards, until the time of their master's imprisonment; and that it is from personal knowledge, or as one of the parties who witnessed the last and most memorable of the testimonies of John to our Lord; in which too there is a clear reference to what had passed before^c: that St. John records the conversation, which stands in the third chapter of his Gospel from verse the twenty-sixth to the end. After the imprisonment of the Baptist, these, amongst others of his followers, might return to their former homes, and to their usual occupations; in which case, when our Lord came from Nazareth to Capernaum, he might find them all there, a little before or a little after the feast of Pentecost.

Or, though this conjecture should not be admitted,

^a Acts i. 21. 22.

^b Vol. i. 355. Dissertation x.

^c John i. 28—37.

still it must be acknowledged that they had attached themselves to him of their own accord ; and therefore might leave him again for a time. Some disciples of our Lord certainly accompanied him as far as Sychar^d ; but it does not appear that any accompanied him thence^e : it is probable that he went alone to Cana^f ; and it seems indisputable that he must have gone alone to Nazareth, and afterwards to Capernaum^g. To suppose that those disciples had been with him at the former place, whom he called immediately after at the latter, would be absurd in the extreme. It is possible then that, while our Saviour himself remained at Sychar^h, the disciples, who had all accompanied him thither, but who could have no inducement to remain, but every inducement not to remain, in a town of Samaria ; continued their journey the same day or on the next into Galilee ; which, if they arrived at mount Gerizim at six o'clock in the evening and in the middle of summer, was very easy to be done. It makes in favour of this supposition, that if they arrived at Gerizim on the evening of May 13, they arrived on the evening of a Thursday ; and as Sychar, according to Relandⁱ, was only twenty-one Roman miles distant from Scythopolis, it would be manifestly possible for them to arrive in Galilee, long before the recurrence of the sabbath, May 15.

The feast of Pentecost was not like either of the other two great solemnities, a seven days' or an eight days' feast ; but, as its name implies, a one day's feast. Three days were all that were necessary to travel from Capernaum to Jerusalem, or back again ; and in the summer season, when travelling might be equally convenient in the night, even less would suffice. Hence,

^d John iv. 8. 27.^e iv. 43.^f iv. 46.^g Luke iv. 16. 31.^h John iv. 40.ⁱ *Palæstina*, ii. cap. v. 423.

though the four disciples in question, like the rest of the male and grown up Israelites, might have been in Jerusalem on the Sunday, and detained there all that day, yet by setting out the next morning, or even at the expiration of the sabbath of Pentecost^k, on that same evening; they would be returned to Capernaum, and might be found pursuing their occupation as fishermen on the lake, at any time either on the Thursday or on the Friday following. Though Pentecost was observed as a sabbath, of which both the Law and Josephus supply proofs; οὐκ ἔστιν δὲ ἡμῖν οὔτε ἐν τοῖς Σάββασιν, οὔτε ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ (scil. τῇ Πεντηκοστῇ) ὁδεύειν^l: yet the distance from Jerusalem to Capernaum was not more than sixty miles; which the common people of Galilee, who could not afford to be absent from home and especially in the middle of summer, when the corn harvest was at its maturity, longer than they could help; by travelling thirty miles a day, might accomplish, if necessary, in two days, and by travelling five and twenty, would accomplish with ease in three. On this point then there can be no difficulty: and I shall conclude this digression, the length of which must be excused by the interest and by the importance of its subject, with one more observation merely; viz. on the delicacy of our Lord, in not expressly calling any of the disciples of the Baptist, so long as their master was still acting upon the stage of his public ministry himself; and yet the apposite and well-timed coincidence of their being called by him now, when John by his imprisonment had been finally separated from them.

The teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum was followed by a miracle at the same time, and in the same place; both these facts being the first instances of their kind in the course of our Saviour's ministry, which are

^k Lev. xxiii. 21. Numb. xxviii. 26.

^l Ant. Jud. xiii. viii. 4.

specified by any Gospel but the last. The history of the miracle^m, in the two evangelists who record it, is remarkably similar; down to the very letter of their accounts: and would alone be sufficient to prove that St. Mark did not transcribe *from*, though he might have written *after* St. Matthew, who omits the miracle altogether; while St. Luke wrote *distinctly from*, though he must have seen St. Mark. The next event, viz. the cure of St. Peter's wife's mother; which St. Mark and St. Luke do both relate in its proper orderⁿ, and St. Matthew out of it^o; belongs to the same day, directly consequent upon the former. The place of this miracle then was Simon's house in Capernaum: the time of it, was the sabbath-day, after the service of the synagogue was over: and, as we may collect from the critical circumstance of the patient's arising and ministering unto, that is, waiting upon them, it occurred about the usual period of some one meal in the day; which, if it was the noonday's repast, would be, upon the sabbath, at the sixth hour, or twelve of the clock with us; one hour later than on the week-days^p. The next event, which was the performance of sundry miracles of healing and dispossession, on such as needed them^q, is shewn by the mention of sunset to belong to a time later than the expiration of the sabbath; that is, about the end of the twelfth hour on the same day.

The next morning, and consequently on the morning of the first day of the week; (which, if it was the first Sunday after Pentecost, would be June 6;) having passed the night in the house of Peter, Jesus retired early to a solitary place, for the sake of private prayer^r. The object of this prayer, as it is reasonable to pre-

^m Mark i. 23—28. Luke iv. 33—37. ⁿ Mark i. 29—31. Luke iv. 38, 39. ^o Matt. viii. 14, 15. ^p Josephus, Vita, 54. ^q Matt. viii. 16, 17. Mark i. 32—34. Luke iv. 40, 41. ^r Mark i. 35—39. Luke iv. 42—44.

sume, was preparation for the circuit of Galilee, about to begin; the place, as it is equally probable, was the same mountain in the vicinity of Capernaum, to which he is seen to resort, for a like purpose, hereafter; and from which he delivered his two sermons. Here at day-break he was rejoined by the disciples, and by the multitude; who had followed him thither from Capernaum. With this time, then, that is, with the morning of the first day of the week, answering to Sunday with us, and probably within seven days since the recurrence of the feast of Pentecost—consequently on June 6—we must date the commencement of a circuit of Galilee; which evidently set out from Capernaum; and though it was confined to Galilee, yet was evidently general in that country; and on all these accounts was the first of its kind, and as complete as any. The intention of making such a progress, in the departure of our Lord from Capernaum itself, is implied by his answer to Simon and the people, when they would have detained him, or prevailed upon him to return to that city; Let us go to the neighbouring *κωμοπόλεις*—(*κώμας καὶ πόλεις*) towns and cities—that I may preach there also; for, for this purpose am I come forth^q; that is, from Capernaum, which he had just left. This circuit is also described by St. Matthew^r. St. Luke says, the work of the circuit was discharged in the synagogues of Galilee; St. Mark, in their synagogues unto all Galilee; and St. Matthew, that Jesus went round all Galilee; and each of them, that the circuit consisted in teaching, and preaching, that is, proclaiming; and performing miracles: from the unity of which descriptions, and from the identity of place and of time assigned to the circuit by the narrative in each instance,

^q Mark i. 38.^r iv. 23—25.

it is impossible to doubt whether it is one and the same event in all these evangelists, or not.

The expediency of undertaking such a progress, as soon after the public commencement of the ministry in Galilee as possible, must be undeniable. The question which we have now to consider is chiefly that of its probable duration; a question of so much the more importance in the present instance, because it is prospectively necessary to instances of the like kind again; since, whatever length of time might be occupied by one such circuit, the same, as it may be supposed, would be taken up by another. There are accordingly two measures by which this duration may be presumptively determined; one, the absolute periphery of the country, or the number of miles which a general circuit of Galilee must have embraced; the other the total amount of its towns and villages, or the number of places which a general circuit of the country might be expected to visit. To the application of the former criterion, it would be necessary to know how many miles our Saviour would travel each day; to that of the latter, what stay he would make in each place; both which may be very uncertain points. Yet this last criterion appears to me on every account the more appropriate, and certainly the more feasible of the two; for every circuit, whether in Galilee or elsewhere, undertaken in the course of our Lord's ministry, being designed for the benefit of the inhabitants of the country, is surely not to be estimated merely by the number of miles which our Lord would travel in a day—even though that number could be determined; but by the number of places which he would visit, and the length of the stay which he would make in each; both which may much more presumptively be conjectured. Nor is it to be supposed that he would merely perambulate Galilee in a

circle, and consequently pass through such towns and villages only as lay on the line of his route. The expressions, περιῆγεν ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, in reference to this circuit, must be understood and interpreted conformably with others; περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας^s: and, διώδενε κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην^t: in reference to circuits subsequently undertaken. What he did on one general progress, unless there were special reasons or special intimations to the contrary; (which, however, is true of no circuit but the last;) he may justly be considered to have done upon another; and he would perhaps be more likely to do on the very first of all, than on any other which came after it. I do not therefore think it necessary to enter upon any examination of the geography of Galilee; with a view at least to the present question; for it would lead to no satisfactory result. Those who desire a description of either this part of Palestine, or of any other of the scenes of our Saviour's ministry, may consult Josephus^u, or the Palestine of Reland, who has collected almost every thing which could be adduced on that subject.

The number of towns and villages (πόλεις καὶ κῶμαι) which Galilee contained, is estimated by Josephus^v at 204: and the population of each upon an average at not less than fifteen thousand souls^w. Now we need not assume, though the language employed by the evangelists would almost justify us in assuming, that, in the course of the same progress, however general, our Lord would visit each of these towns and villages in its turn; we will assume that he would visit only one half of the number; and, what is no extravagant supposition, that he would pass, upon an average, one day

^s Matt. ix. 35.^t Luke viii. 1.^u Vita, 37. Bell. iii. iii.^v Vita, 45.^w Bell. Jud. iii. iii. 2.

in each. We will assume also that, for every week of the continuance of the progress, he would necessarily be stationary somewhere during the four and twenty hours of the sabbatic rest. Even upon this calculation, which every one will allow to be moderate and reasonable, the duration of a circuit would never be less than three months, and, probably, never less than four. This, then, we may assume, in every instance of what is perceived to have been a general circuit, not otherwise limited, as the nearest approximation to the exact measure of its continuance. Consequently, the circuits, which began about the feast of Pentecost, would be over about the feast of Tabernacles; of which fact we shall find, if I am not mistaken, incidental notices supplied, on more than one occasion, by the gospel-narrative itself. And it is a general argument in favour of its truth, first, that, on this principle, a circuit would commonly begin after wheat-harvest was over, and would terminate when seed-time was ready to arrive; the effect of which would be that the people in the interval between would be enabled to attend upon our Saviour, with the least inconvenience to themselves: and, secondly, that it would coincide with the period of the year when travelling could best be performed only in the morning and the evening of the day; and when resting throughout the day, so obviously necessary for the purpose of teaching, would not be more necessary for that purpose, than expedient in itself.

The course of the present circuit, we may conjecture from St. Matthew^k, was, upon the whole, as follows—first, along the western side of the Jordan, northward; which would disseminate the fame of Jesus in Decapolis: secondly, along the confines of the tetrarchy of Philip, westward; which would make

^k iv. 24, 25.

him known throughout Syria: thirdly, by the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, southward: and, lastly, along the verge of Samaria, and the western region of the lake of Galilee—the nearest points to Judæa Proper, and to Peræa—until it returned to Capernaum. In the course of the progress, if he visited Bethsaida, he might be joined by Philip^l; if he visited Cana, by Nathanael^m; and if there was such a village as Iscariot*, by Judas Iscariot also. All our Lord's disciples were natives of Galilee, and probably first became his disciples in Galilee. No incident, however, is expressly recorded as having transpired on the circuit itself; a circumstance by no means more peculiar to this first, than to any other of the number, except the last: for these periods in our Lord's ministry, though in themselves integral portions of its whole duration, and as full of action and employment as any part of it, are invariably the least related in detail of all. The first sermon from the Mount^o, delivered, as I apprehend, at the close of the circuit, is so far an exception to this rule. If it was delivered on what tradition has pointed out as the mountain of the beatitudes, it was delivered near to Capernaum; and, therefore, either at the very beginning, or at the end of the circuit; the latter of which is much the more probable supposition: the former would be inconsistent both with the cause alleged for the sermon^p, and with what happened at the outset of the circuit^q. Whether this is the same sermon with that on record elsewhere^r, or is distinct from it, is a question which will be considered hereafter.

* Theophylact, i. 46. E. in ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος ὠνόμασεν. So Matt. x: ἀλλ' Ἰσκαριώτην αὐτὸν likewise Chrysostomⁿ.

^l John i. 45.
Homilia xxxii. 3.
Luke iv. 42—44.

^m xxi. 2.
^o Matt. v—viii. 1.
^r Luke vi. 20—end.

ⁿ Operum vii. 369. A. in Matthæum
^p v. 1. ^q Mark i. 35—39.

The next event, and posterior to this circuit of Galilee, because an event which took place on the lake of Capernaum, and, consequently, presupposes our Lord to have been returned to Capernaum, is the miraculous draught of fishes^s; a very different transaction, as I hope to prove elsewhere, from the call of the four disciples in St. Matthew, or in St. Mark^t. The time of this event, then, could not be earlier than the first feast of Tabernacles, by which the circuit would expire; and it might be later. The first feast of Tabernacles in the course of our Saviour's ministry began October 4, and expired October 11^u.

The cure of the leper, which is next recorded^v, as we may conclude for the following reasons, did not take place in Capernaum, nor, consequently, while Jesus was still resident there after his return. First, Luke v. 12, is much too indefinite to be understood of so well known a city as Capernaum, especially after the mention of the lake^w, just before: secondly, the miracle took place somewhere near the desert^x, and, therefore, we may presume, not in the land of Genesareth: thirdly, the entering into Capernaum, Mark ii. 1, is opposed to the entering into Capernaum, i. 21, before, as a second instance of the kind to a first; which implies either that our Lord had never entered Capernaum again, as yet, since his departure thence at i. 35, or that if he had, he had left it again before the return, ii. 1: fourthly, lepers were forbidden by the Jewish law to enter into the towns or the villages; they were condemned to live apart from society, and to wear their clothes rent, as a mark of their situation^y. If this was the case, even St. Luke's expres-

^s Luke v. 1—11. ^t Matt. iv. 18—22. Mark i. 16—20. ^u Vol. i. 332.
 Dissertation vii. ^v Matt. viii. 2—4. Mark i. 40—45. Luke v. 12—16.
^w v. 1. ^x Luke v. 16. Mark i. 45. ^y Lev. xiii. 45, 46. 2 Kings vii.
 3. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 31.

sion, As he was in one of the cities, need not be too strictly understood; nor further than to denote that, when this leper, probably having seen our Lord from afar^z, fell down before him, he was in the neighbourhood of some one city*.

We possess, then, in this fact, an intimation that, posterior even to the first circuit of Galilee, Jesus was engaged somewhere distinct from Capernaum, which otherwise we should not have discovered; and the discovery is so far valuable, that it helps to account for an integral period of time, between the close of this first circuit, and the arrival of the next Passover—an interval of nearly six months; to fill up which, however, only two or three incidents are left on record. Part of this time might be spent in Capernaum, after the return; part, and perhaps the greatest portion, in the studied seclusion and privacy which followed the miracle, and were intended to avoid the effects of its notoriety. For our Lord did not return to Capernaum, except δι' ἡμερῶν^a, which may mean a considerable time; and when he did return, it was not far from the close of the first year of his ministry.

And hence we may infer that this cure of the leper was the first specific miracle of the kind, which had yet been performed; and that this is the true reason why each of the three evangelists concurs to relate this one, but no other of the same description again. Such miracles as these, considered in a symbolical point of view, were peculiarly characteristic of a Messiah who

* A confirmed leper, indeed, was clean (Lev. xiii. 13): and this particular leper might be in that state. There are expressions, in each of the accounts of this mi-

racle, which appear to imply that Jesus was in some house apart, when the leper applied to him; and that his cure took place in private.

^z Compare Luke xvii. 12.

^a Mark ii. 1.

should make atonement for sin ; as the plague of leprosy itself was of the spiritual or moral taint of sin : and it is evident, from the account of our Saviour's miracles, both the general and the special, as hitherto given, that, like those which he empowered the Twelve, and also the Seventy, to perform in his own life-time on earth, limiting their power to these—they had yet consisted only in the cure of diseases, strictly so called—*νόσοι καὶ μαλακίαι*—and in the ejection of unclean spirits ; that is, in the simplest kind of miracles in general. The great notoriety produced by this miracle, and, consequently, the necessity of withdrawing himself for a time, which it imposed on our Lord, make in favour of the same conclusion*. It is added, however, by St. Mark and St. Luke, that the multitude found him out, even in the deserts, that is, in the less populous parts of the country ; (for, wherever he was, and however desirous of concealment, still he could not be absolutely hid^b;) and that they still resorted to him, to hear him, and to be healed from their infirmities, even there ; so that this retirement, long as it might continue, was not idly or unprofitably spent. Yet Jesus himself, though followed by the people, kept purposely Withdrawing into the deserts, and praying.

The next event, the cure of the paralytic^c, is clearly to be placed in Capernaum, and in some private house, (probably Peter's,) our Lord's usual abode there. Nor could it have been long after the return ; for the bringing in of the paralytic was produced, according

* It is not improbable that this very individual might be the same who is mentioned afterwards, apparently as a person once cured by our Lord, under

the name of Simon the leper. If so, his name is intimately associated with those of Martha, Mary, and Lazarus ; and he was a person of some consequence.

^b Cf. Mark vii. 24.

^c Matt. ix. 2—8. Mark ii. 1—12. Luke v. 17—26.

to St. Mark, by the news of the return; and hence the presence of Scribes from all the surrounding villages, (*ἐκ πάσης κώμης*,) which St. Luke alludes to, is very probably to be explained. They might have come with our Saviour to Capernaum, as part of the resort mentioned before; for Josephus also adverts to the *κωμῶν γραμματεῖς* by name^d, as a sort of village schoolmasters, or as a class of inferior municipal magistrates; who might consequently be met with every where*.

With regard to the call of Levi^e, which certainly took place on the same day, the only question would be, whether it took place on the way to, or on the way

* There are several passages in the Gospels, which might be cited to prove that the names of *Γραμματεὺς*, *Νομικὸς*, *Νομαδιδάσκαλος*, respectively, were convertible terms, and meant one and the same description of persons: who might originally have been (and probably still were) strictly the scribes, or copyists of the law as such, and were now by profession, and perhaps always had been, its interpreters and expositors also. They belonged to the tribe of Levi in general; though probably not to the family of Aaron in particular. A certain number of their body, twenty-four as I apprehend, represented the rest in the great council of the sanhedrim, as made up of the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes. The elders were most probably the chiefs of the people, belonging to the other tribes; the chief priests were the seve-

ral heads of the twenty-four courses of the priests; the scribes comprehended the heads of the rest of the family of Levi, which also was divided into courses as well as that of Aaron. As the entire number of the sanhedrim was seventy-two, and as the chief priests were twenty-four in number, and as the elders (see Rev. iv. 4) were the same; the scribes must have been twenty-four also.

That the time of the cure of the paralytic was probably soon after the feast of Encænïa, is presumptively implied by the mention of the presence of scribes from Jerusalem, as well as from other quarters. This seems to me to intimate that the Encænïa was past, and had not been attended by our Saviour. The Encænïa, in the first year of our Lord's ministry, began December 12 and ended December 19.

^d Ant. Jud. xvi. vii. 3. Bell. i. xxiv. 3. Luke v. 27, 28.

^e Matt. ix. 9. Mark ii. 13, 14.

from, the lake*; a question, which St. Matthew and St. Luke leave in doubt, but St. Mark decides in the affirmative; shewing that Jesus, before he called Levi, had made an end of teaching. We may infer, therefore, that the cure of the paralytic happened early in the day, and the call of Levi comparatively late; for our Lord commonly resorted to the lake for the purpose of teaching, in the morning^f—whence, if the entertainment, on record in St. Mark and in St. Luke^g, was given by Levi in the course of the same day, and in consequence of his call, it would be a supper; and this, as we shall see hereafter, is the strongest argument that each of these occasions is distinct from Matthew ix. 10–17. On this question, however, I shall enter elsewhere, by itself. With the facts, hitherto considered, the Gospel accounts of the first year of our Saviour's ministry are brought to a close.

* Artemidorus, *Oneirocritica*, iii. 59, observes, *Τελώνης . . . ἀεὶ γὰρ πρὸς ταῖς ἐξόδοις ἔστηκε*, which implies that the *τελώνιον* at which Levi was sitting, was somewhere outside of Capernaum: probably upon the lake itself. Philostratus in his life of Apollonius

speaks of a *τελώνης* whose duty it was to sit at the Zeugma; or that part of the Euphrates, where travellers from Syria into Mesopotamia were wont to cross the river. *Vita Apollonii*, i. xiv. 28. C.

^f Luke v. 1. 5. Matt. xiii. 1. compared with Mark iv. 35. iii. 20. ^g Mark ii. 15—22. Luke v. 29. to the end.

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART III.

General prospective survey of our Lord's ministry in Galilee, year the second.

THE first intimation of the second year, which we possess, is the history of the walking through the corn-fields^a; concerning which, I have shewn elsewhere^b that the disposition, thus manifested by our Lord's enemies, to take exceptions against his conduct, or, what was the same thing, the conduct of his disciples, for supposed infractions of the sabbath, is a new feature in the gospel narrative; which, however frequently it may recur hereafter, cannot be traced further back than the time of the transactions in Jerusalem, John v. 1–16. It was argued from this coincidence that the feast there specified was the feast of the Passover, next in order after the same feast, John ii. 13, and before the same, John vi. 4. This Passover, therefore, and the incidents which ensue so soon upon it, discriminate the close of that one and the first year of our Lord's ministry, which might be called the *acceptable year* of the Lord; during which the rulers of the Jews either had not yet made up their minds to reject him, or had not begun to conspire against his life; but after which time they had done both: and this conclusion we may proceed to confirm a little more fully as follows.

The walking through the corn-fields in question is placed by St. Matthew and by St. Mark simply upon the sabbath; but by St. Luke on a sabbath which he

^a Matt. xii. 1–8. Mark ii. 23–28. Luke vi. 1–5.
Dissertation xxiii. Part i.

^b Supra, 256.

calls the Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον : a designation which ranks among the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of the New Testament, and, like another of the same class, τὸν ἐπιούσιον^c*, has

* The meaning of this term, to which an allusion has thus occurred, may be explained as follows.

The use of ἡ ἐπιούσα is just as common as the use of ἡ αὔριον—with the ellipsis in each instance of ἡμέρα—for *to-morrow*, or *the morrow*, in opposition to *σήμερον*, *to-day*, or *this day*. Vide Acts vii. 26. xvi. 11. xx. 15. xxi. 18. xxiii. 11.

From the former of these, considered as a substantive, the adjective ἐπιούσιος, in the kindred signification of *of*, or *belonging to*, *the morrow*, would be regularly derived. The words of the petition, then, are equivalent to these—τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν, τὸν τῆς ἐπιούσης, δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, Give us this day our bread of the morrow : and the bread of the morrow is a genuine Hebraism for the bread which is wanted to-day. The bread of to-day is in one sense the bread of the morrow ; for it is the bread which must sustain us until the morrow. It is the bread, ὁ εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν—the bread which is wanted *against* the morrow. The change which St. Luke has made in the terms of St. Matthew, places this relation to the morrow in a still clearer light : τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, xi. 3. Give us every day our bread of the morrow ; or, more literally, Give us, for the day, our bread of the morrow.

Origen, Operum i. 245. F. De Oratione, 27 : declares him-

self much perplexed by this term ἐπιούσιος, which he had never met with either in common discourse, or in profane writers ; nor any thing in the Old or New Testament which resembled it, except περιούσιος in the sense of *peculiar*—the version of the Seventy for Exod. xix. 5 : a version adopted by Aquila, (Hieronymus, Operum iii. 183 I. *ad med.* : in Malachiæ iv.) as that of ἐξαίρετος was by Symmachus, (Theodorit, Operum i. 147. Quæstiones in Exodum. Interp. xxxv.) and that of περιποίησιν in general by others. (Hieronymus, *loc. cit.* and iv. Pars i^a. 21. *ad princip.*)

And, though he leans to the derivation of the word from οὐσία, *substantia*, yet 249. C. he observes : ἐρεῖ δέ τις τὸν ἐπιούσιον παρὰ τὸ ἐπιέναι, καὶ ἐσχηματίζεσθαι ὥστε αἰτεῖν ἡμᾶς κελεύεσθαι τὸν ἄρτον τὸν οἰκείον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἵνα προλαβὼν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς ἤδη ἡμῖν δωρήσεται, ὥστε τὸ οἶον εἶναι αὔριον δοθῆσόμενον σήμερον ἡμῖν δοθῆναι : σήμερον μὲν τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰῶνος λαμβανόμενον, αὔριον δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος.

The old Italic version, it is to be observed, renders it by *cotidianum* ; and by Jerome, (Operum iv. Pars i. 21. *ad princip.* in Matt. vi.) it is said : In Evangelio, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, pro *supersubstantiali* pane, reperi *MAHAR*, quod dicitur *crastinum* ; ut sit sensus : *Panem nostrum crastinum*, id est *est-futurum*, da nobis *hodie*. Cf.

created no small difficulty how to explain it. Knowing the great exactness of this evangelist, we may be per-

further, *ibid.* 431 and 432. in Tit. ii.

Joannes Damascenus, *De Orthodoxa Fide*, lib. iv. p. 114. *ad sinistram*, cap. 90, seems to have been aware that the meaning of *ἐπιούσιος*, thus contended for, in the sense at least of *future*, was an allowable one, when he observes upon the sacramental bread, οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἄρτου, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιούσιος. τὸ γὰρ ἐπιούσιον δηλοῖ ἢ τὸν μέλλοντα, τουτέστι τὸν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἢ τὸν πρὸς συντήρησιν τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν λαμβανόμενον: in which sense Suidas also explains it, in voce, ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων.

Toup, indeed, in his note on this passage of Suidas, objects to the opinion of Kuster, Scaliger, and Salmasius, all of whom agreed in deriving *ἐπιούσιος* from *ἐπιούσα*, that the word, so formed, *Ne Græcum quidem videtur*: and he contends that it is derived not from *οὔσα*, but from *οὐσία*. But the truth is, that even *οὐσία*, whence Toup would form *οὔσιος*, is itself derived from *οὔσα*, the feminine nominative of the participle of the substantive verb *εἰμί*. Admitting that there was such a substantive in use as *ἡ ἐπιούσα*, in the sense of the morrow, we might contend that *ἐπιούσιος*, of or belonging to *ἡ ἐπιούσα*, was regularly formed from it; according to a well known rule of one of the modes of the formation of adjectives from feminine substantives in *η* and *α*, which is simply to change the termination into *ιος*. Thus, *τιμῇ*, *τί-*

μιος, *βουλῇ*, *βούλιος*, *ἡμέρα*, *ἡμέριος*, *θάλασσα*, *θαλάσσιος*; and what is still more to the point, *ἐκούσα*, *ἐκούσιος*, *ἀκούσα*, *ἀκούσιος*, &c. The objection, therefore, of Toup to the irregularity of the formation in question, is without foundation. I fear his own explanation of the sense of the word, supposing it derived from *ἡ οὐσία*, would be much more open to objection. The bread *τῆς οὐσίας*, or *πρὸς τὴν οὐσίαν*, in the sense of the bread of our subsistence, would scarcely be Greek. It is a nice distinction, but still an intelligible one—that there is a difference between the *οὐσία* of a given subject, and the *εἶναι*, or the *ὑπάρχειν* of the same. The very passage which Toup quotes from Porphyry, in support of his opinion, illustrates this distinction; and so far makes against him: *εἰς τὸ εἶναι συνέχει τὴν οὐσίαν*. Bread of our subsistence, bread, *unde vivamus*, as Toup explains it, is bread *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμῶν*, not *εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν*. It may be very true that *διὰ τοῦ εἶναι, ἡ οὐσία συνέχεται*: but it is also true that the *οὐσία* of a given subject would remain the same, though the *εἶναι*, or *ὑπάρχειν*, of it, in the sense of continuing to be and to live, were no more. The proper sense of *οὐσία* in Greek, is to express the logical *substantia*; the *pars materialis* more particularly of the essence; the *πρώτη ὕλη* of things that are—without which they could not so much as be. The *οὐσία* of the dead subject in this sense would be nothing different from that of the living; for to

suaded it was not without design that he added a specific description to a note of time, which his predecessors

the *οὐσία* in this sense, to be, or not to be, that is, to be living or to be dead, is alike indifferent. The bread of our subsistence, then, would not be properly expressed in Greek by *ὁ ἄρτος τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν*, any more than in Latin, by *panis substantiæ nostræ*, or in English by *the bread of our substance*.

Mr. Harmer observes that it is usual in the East at present, to prepare the corn, intended for the day's consumption, always at daybreak on the same day: and to bake no more bread in their ovens at once than will suffice for the day: Vol. i. chap. iv. obs. viii. p. 269. Cf. also Obs. iv. p. 250, and Obs. ix. p. 277. They live in short, as far as bread is concerned, *de die in diem*. If such was the practice anciently, it reflects additional illustration upon the sense of *ἐπιούσιος*: and that it was so, may be inferred from Luke xvii. 34, 35, (Cf. Matt. xxiv. 41,) and Luke xi. 5-7.

While I am upon the subject of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* which occur in the Gospels, I will take the liberty of adding one more, peculiar also to St. Luke; yet not so much on account of the peculiarity of the word, as of that of the sense in which it is used. This is in the use of *ἀνάστασιν*, ii. 34—the difficulty of understanding which text, so long as the word was considered to possess there its common signification of resurrection, has often been painfully felt by myself, and, probably, by others also. But the word

ἀνάστασις possesses another sense, in which it is equivalent to *ἀναστάτωσις*, *overthrow* or *subversion*; of which these are specimens from the best Greek classics. Φράζων ἄλωσιν, Ἰλίου τ' ἀνάστασιν. Æschylus, Agam. 572. Μητροκτόνους τ' ἀγῶνας, οὓς οἱ μοὶ γάμοι | θήσουσιν, οἴκων τ' Ἀτρέως ἀνάστασιν. Euripides, Troades, 367. Εἰς δ' ἀνάστασιν | δόμων περαίνει πολλάκις τὰ τοιάδε. Euripides, Dictys, Fragm. Ἴπ- | πιοχάρμας τε κλόνους, | πόλεων τ' ἀναστάσεις. Æschylus, Persæ, 109. Οὓς Βρέννος ἀφ' ἐσπερίου θαλάσσης | ἤγαγεν Ἑλλήνων ἐπ' ἀνάστασιν. Callimachi Fragmenta. Πύργων πρηνισμοὶ δέ τ', ἀναστασίαι τε πολλῶν. Sibyllina Oracula, iv. 493. 10.

Isocrates, Oratio xv. 135: ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκείνου στρατηγίας οὐδεὶς ἂν οὐτ' ἀναστάσεις εὖροι γεγενημένας, οὔτε πολιτειῶν μεταβολάς. Demosthenes, Olynth. ii. 1: ὥστε τὰς πρὸς ἐκείνον διαλλαγὰς πρῶτον μὲν ἀπίστον, εἴτα τῆς ἐαυτῶν πατρίδος νομίζειν ἀνάστασιν εἶναι. Cf. Pollux, Onomasticon, iii. cap. 13: Suidas, ἀνάστασις: Diodorus Siculus, xiii. 28: Dio Chrysostomus, Oratio xxxvi. 76. l. 25: Maximus Tyrius, Dissertatio xiii. 4: Euripides, Troades, 921: Anthologia, iii. 223: Orphei, De Terræ Motibus, 26. A multitude of other instances might be produced from Philo, Josephus, and the contemporary writers. Equally common are *ἀναστατήρ*, *ἀναστάτης*, *ἀνάστατος*, and *ἀναστατώ*, in their analogous senses. The latter occurs thrice in the New Testament itself.

had left indefinite; and, knowing his great precision in the use of terms also, we may conclude that, peculiar

Acts xvii. 6. xxi. 38. Gal. v. 12. Even ἀνίστασθαι or ἀνεστηκέναι is used in this sense. Thus, Καὶ νῦν πόλις μὲν πᾶς ἀνέστηκεν δορί. Euripides, Hecuba, 489: Cf. Andromache, 1225. Demosthenes, Oratio xvi. 29: μὴ περιορᾶν πόλεις ἀρχαίας ἐξανεστώσας. Vide Suidas, Ἀνάστατος and Ἀναστήσας.

In this sense of overthrow, subversion, or prostration, must Luke ii. 34. εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν, be understood: I. Because the whole prophecy is ominous, and melancholy; predicting evil, and no good, both to the infant Christ—and to his mother the Virgin—and to the many in Israel^d; to which general relation it would manifestly be repugnant, were ἀνάστασις to retain its more usual meaning.

II. Because the same many in Israel are described as the subjects both of the πτώσις and of the ἀνάστασις in question; that is, if the former means falling, and the latter rising again, the same many, who are the subjects of the falling, are the subjects also of the rising again: and these terms being manifestly ἀντίστοιχα, the latter involves the undoing the effect implied by the former. Hence, in whatever sense the many were to fall, in the contrary sense they would be to rise again. If their falling, then, implies their unbelief, their rising again must imply their be-

lief; that is, the prophecy would predict that the same many in Israel should both reject and believe in Christ—that Christ should be set to produce both the belief and the unbelief of the same persons—in which case, it would both involve a contradiction in terms, and be contrary to the matter of fact. Christ was certainly rejected by the many in Israel, and so far might be set to occasion their falling; but the same many persisted in his rejection, and so far never rose again from their fall.

III. Because πτώσις is not absolutely tautologous with ἀνάστασις: the one declares the antecedent—the other the consequent—or the one the cause—and the other the effect. Persons must fall, before they can lie prostrate; and πτώσις is falling—ἀνάστασις is prostration. In like manner, a person must often stumble, even before he can fall^e; and as Symeon implies here that the many must fall, before they should be prostrate, so does St. Paul, Rom. xi. 11, that they must stumble, before they should fall.

And this leads me to observe, lastly, that the whole prediction is nothing more than a prophecy of the rejection of the Jews, because of their rejection of Christ—whom it sets forth as an obstacle, placed in their way, that so they might

^d Compare in particular the οὗτος κείται . . . εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον, of the prediction, with Job vii. 20. and xvi. 12, the “setting as a mark” there alluded to.

^e Cf. Isaiah viii. 14, 15.

as this denomination may be, if a better, or one more expressive for the purpose contemplated in selecting it, could have been found, he would not have employed this.

The word is compounded of two elements, *δευτερος* and *πρῶτος*, each of them alike significant ; and, rendered according to the genius of the Greek language in its compound phraseology, it would seem to denote, *first after the second*, and not, *second after the first* ; *primo-secundus*, not, *secundo-primus*. This being the case, its very construction appears to hold out the torch to its meaning, and to confirm the conjecture of Scaliger, to whom the merit of the discovery is due. The *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον*, here spoken of, must be some sabbath considered as *first*, reckoned after something *second*, not as *second*, reckoned after something *first*.

By the original appointment of the Law^d, the computation of weeks preliminary to the day of Pentecost, which every one knows to have been seven in number, was required to begin and to proceed from a certain day in the feast of unleavened bread, which was called the morrow after the sabbath ; as the first of its extremes inclusive. This morrow after the sabbath the Sadducees understood to mean the morrow after the *ordinary* sabbath, and the Pharisees, the morrow after the *extraordinary* ; which always fell,

stumble over it, fall, and be prostrate. It agrees, therefore, with Rom. ix. 32, where St. Paul is reasoning on the same dispensation : They, *that is*, the Jews, have stumbled at the stone of stumbling : and both are but the repetition of a more ancient description of the same causes and the same effects : Behold, I do set in Sion a stone of stum-

bling and a rock of offence. Rom. x. 33. This stone of stumbling, and rock of offence, was Christ—and the scandal of the cross—concerning which Symeon might consequently well say, Behold this child is set for the falling and subversion of many in Israel. Compare also 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8, which confirms this interpretation.

^d Lev. xxiii. 10, 11, 15, 16. Deut. xvi. 9, 10.

by appointment, on the first day of the feast. The computation of the Sadducees consequently began always with the first day of the week; and therefore Pentecost, according to them, necessarily fell every year on the first day of the week: the computation of the Pharisees began with the sixteenth of Nisan, which could not be the first day of the week, unless the fifteenth before it had been the seventh. These modes of reckoning would naturally sometimes coincide; and Josephus has specified a case in point when they did so^e: ἐνέστη γὰρ ἡ Πεντηκοστή ἑορτὴ μετὰ τὸ Σάββατον *.

* The particular year in which this coincidence happened has been the subject of great controversy, and difference of opinion among the learned; nor perhaps can it be exactly determined. The circumstance, to which Josephus alludes, happened some time in the reign of Antiochus, surnamed Euergetes and Sidetes; whom Eckhel, *Doctrina Numm. Vett.* iii. 235, calls Antiochus the *seventh*: and the most general opinion has been that it happened the year before the assumed date of his death in battle against the Parthians, B. C. 130. *Period. Julian.* 4584. But Eckhel has shewn, from his extant coins, that he was alive so late as B. C. 127. *Period. Julian.* 4587. On this subject, therefore, historical testimony and the evidence of coins are decidedly committed together; unless indeed the authority of the second book of Maccabees,

which speaks of the death of a king Antiochus, *Æræ Seleucidarum* 188, and consequently B. C. 125 or 124, in the temple of Nanea, or, rather Anæaf, Aneitis, or Anaitis, in Persia, (i. 10. 16.) be by any admitted, as corroborative of the testimony of the latter g.

From the detail of events in the eighth chapter of the thirteenth book of the *Antiquities*, I should clearly infer that, whether right or wrong in itself, Josephus meant to place the time of this expedition, upon which Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus, and in the course of which he halted two days upon the borders of the river Lycus, in the year next after his invasion of Judæa and siege of Jerusalem. That invasion was made in the *first* year of Hyrcanus, but early in the spring; and consequently B. C. 134: and the siege of Jerusalem, begun about the time of the spring rains in that year, continued until the

^e Ant. xiii. viii. 4. ^f Plutarch, Artaxerxes, 27: Strabo xi. 8. §. 4. 478: 13. §. 16. 601: xii. 3. §. 37. 138: xv. 3. §. 15. 225: xvi. 1. §. 4. 249: Stephanus Byzantinus, Ζῆλα: Suidas, *Ἀναία*. ^g In Athenæus also, x. 53. (Cf. xii. 56:) there is an allusion to the death of this Antiochus, from the sixteenth book of Posidonius of Apamea, which may be thought to imply that he did not perish in battle: and still more the statement which occurs in *Ælian*, *De Animalibus*, x. 34. compared with *Obsequens*, *De Prodigis*, xxvi.

And whichever of these computations might be the right one, it is truly remarkable that, in the year when our

feast of Tabernacles ; soon after which, Antiochus received the submissions of Hyrcanus, and made peace with him. It agrees with this statement that the invasion of Judæa is placed in the fourth of Antiochus, dated from the death of Trypho ; and the death of Trypho (Eckhel, iii. 234.) was U. C. 616, or B. C. 138. The fourth year from that date might synchronize with B. C. 134.

Julius Obsequens, de Prodigis, cap. xxvi. U. C. 624, B. C. 130: Antiocho regi Syriæ, ingenti exercitu dimicanti, hirundines in tabernaculo nidum fecerunt: quo prodigio neglecto prælium commisit, et a Parthis occisus est. By Diodorus Siculus also, (SS. Deperditorum Vaticana Collectio, ii. 105, Excerpta e lib. xxxiv.viii.) his defeat and supposed death are distinctly placed in the spring quarter of the year: τῆς ἐαρινῆς ὥρας τῇ χλιᾷ τηκούσης τὴν χίονα, καὶ τῶν καρπῶν ἐκ τοῦ συνεχοῦς πάγου πρὸς τὴν φύην καὶ βλάστησιν προϊόντων, κ', τ. λ. In this case, his defeat or death could not happen so early as the spring quarter of B. C. 133: and, as to its possibly happening in that of the ensuing year, B. C. 132, it is to be observed, that Justin, xxxviii. 10, while he agrees with the other two authorities in placing the event of the war in the same quarter of the year, yet speaks of Antiochus' being previously victorious in three battles ; which may authorize the inference that the war lasted three campaigns ; and would reconcile the testimony of Josephus with that of Obsequens ;

the former relating to what happened at the beginning of the war, when the army was advanced no further than the river Lycus in Mesopotamia, the latter to what happened at the end, three years later, B.C. 130.

The year, therefore, after the pacification with Antiochus, B.C. 133, being understood, as I think the account of Josephus obviously supposes it to be understood, of the year when Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus in his Parthian expedition ; B. C. 133. Period. Julian. 4581, is to be understood as the year when the day of Pentecost fell on the first day of the week. It may be proved, by a reference to Pingré's Table of Eclipses, that there was a mean full moon for that year, and the meridian of Jerusalem, on March 28. Hence, if March 28 coincided with Nisan 15, March 29 coincided with Nisan 16.

Between March 29, B.C. 133, *inclusive*, and the same day, A. D. 1 *exclusive*, the interval, expressed by tropical days and nights, is 48,577 such days and nights, with five hours, thirty minutes, twenty-one seconds, over: or this fraction of time being disregarded, 6939 weeks, four days, exactly. A. D. 1 according to the Tables, March 29 was a Tuesday, or as I should consider it, a Thursday ; and March 25 was a Sunday. Now March 29 B. C. 133, would fall on the same day of the week as March 25, A. D. 1. If so, March 29, and, therefore, Nisan 16, B.C. 133, was a Sunday ; that is, the day of Pentecost, which was

Saviour suffered, if the Friday on which he suffered was the fourteenth of Nisan, the Sunday, on which he rose again from the dead, must have been the sixteenth; and it was indifferent from what point of time the calculation of Pentecost, the appointed period of the diffusion of the Holy Ghost, might otherwise have begun. In that year, the fifteenth of Nisan and the seventh day of the week coincided.

That the computation of the Pharisees, however, was either more correct in itself, or at least, the computation in vogue throughout the period of the Gospel history, appears from the authorities in the margin^f; each of which shews that the day of Pentecost was understood to fall on the fiftieth day, inclusive of either extreme, from the day of presenting the wave-sheaf; and that day to fall on the day after the fifteenth of Nisan, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; and consequently always on the sixteenth of Nisan, the second day of that feast. It is this second day of the ἄζυμα, the day of the consecration of the δράγμα, or first-fruits of the new barley, which by an apparently felicitous, and an equally reasonable conjecture, Scaliger concluded to be meant by the first of the elements in the compound denomination, δευτερόπρωτον. It was necessary to reckon seven weeks, or rather as the original Hebrew expresses it, seven *sabbaths of days*, in succession, from the second day of the Azyma as their common ἀρχή, down to the fiftieth after it inclusive. What then seems more natural, than that these weeks, or these sabbaths of days, should be or might be denominated respectively according to the order of their always the same day of the week fell out on the day after the as the 16th of Nisan, actually sabbath.

^f Philo, ii. 206. l. 22—30. De Decem Oraculis: 294. l. 5—36. De Septenario et Festis Diebus: Jos. Ant. iii. x. 5, 6: Maimonides, De Sacrificis Jugibus, vii. 3. 11. 22.

succession, as referred to this common beginning? the first seven days collectively, the first sabbath after the second, (σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον;) the next seven days, the second sabbath after the second, (σάββατον δευτεροδέυτερον;) and so on, to the seventh sabbath after the second, the σάββατον δευτερέβδομον.

Notwithstanding however the great apparent probability of this conjecture, it is liable to an objection which perhaps will be considered to possess some weight. The Jews were commanded to number *weeks* as such, from the ἀρχή in question, not *sabbaths*; whence, if they made use of any such denominations, to express the order and succession of the parts of the computation, as these, they would be denominations for the order and succession of *weeks*, not of *sabbaths*. But whatever be the origin or import of the denomination in St. Luke, it is a denomination for a sabbath, and not for a week. It is a denomination also for the ordinary sabbath: it cannot be understood even of some day, which though a sabbath was an extraordinary one. The parallel places of the other two evangelists, who specify this sabbath absolutely; and the allusion to *another* sabbath so soon after at Luke vi. 6, in opposition to vi. 1, which at least must have been the ordinary sabbath; appear to me demonstrative of this fact.

If so, however, it seems to follow that, though σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον might express the first sabbath or week of days, after the sixteenth of Nisan, the σάββατον δευτεροδέυτερον the second, and so on; and though the use of such a phrase might actually be proved to have been current among the Jews: yet this use of the term would not be strictly in point to the present instance. The σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον of St. Luke is not meant of a week, which was δευτερόπρωτον in any sense, but of a sabbath, or seventh day in particular, which was so.

It follows, also, that though the cognate denomination δευτεροδεύτερον might be applied to the second week of days, referred to the same beginning, with just as much reason as that of δευτερόπρωτον to the first; yet it is not equally obvious whether a similar denomination would have been applied to a sabbath; whether in short another sabbath would have been called δευτεροδεύτερον, because the preceding one had been called δευτερόπρωτον. There might be special reasons for calling a certain sabbath δευτερόπρωτον, which would not make it necessary to call another δευτεροδεύτερον, δευτερότριτον, or the like.

The literal version of St. Luke's words: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ: would be this: Now it came to pass on a sabbath which was *second-first*: upon which, as it seems to me, two constructions only can be put. It was some sabbath which must be considered as both *second* and *first*, without reference to any thing else; or it was some sabbath, which must be considered *first* in reference to something *second*. And though, how a sabbath of any kind could be considered ἀπλῶς a second as well as a first, it might be difficult to say; yet a sabbath, which fell upon the seventeenth of Nisan, might be described as first in reference to something second. If it followed the sixteenth of Nisan, it might be called δευτερόπρωτον; for the sixteenth of Nisan, referred to the feast of ἄζυμα, was something δεύτερον, and the seventeenth of Nisan, referred to the sixteenth, was πρῶτον. A sabbath, then, which fell upon the seventeenth of Nisan, referred to the *second* day of the feast of ἄζυμα, might be said to be δευτερόπρωτον: and if St. Luke had any special reason for discriminating this sabbath in particular, he might give it such a name. Now we may perhaps conceive some such reason in the nature of the material action, supposed to be performed on

this day ; which was the eating of the corn by the disciples as they went along. Had it not been on some day *after* the sixteenth of Nisan in general, the disciples would not have been eating corn at all : had it not been on a sabbath-day which fell after the sixteenth of Nisan, they would not have been eating corn on the sabbath-day in particular.

It is a singular confirmation of this conclusion, that U.C. 781, A. D. 28, the ordinary sabbath-day actually fell on the seventeenth of Nisan. The Passover was celebrated that year on March 29, and March 29 was Wednesday. If so, the seventeenth of Nisan coincided with April 1, and April 1 was Saturday. This then appears to me the true import of the phrase in question. It was meant to denote one particular day ; a sabbath which fell on the seventeenth of Nisan, and therefore on the day immediately after the sixteenth. And it was meant to denote that day, on account of the incident which transpired on that day. Had not our Saviour's disciples been eating corn on the sabbath, the Pharisees could not have taken exception at their conduct : had not that sabbath fallen *after* the sixteenth of Nisan in general, they could not have been eating corn upon it at all. That it fell on the day after the sixteenth in particular might be due to the circumstances of the case. But if this was the case, and it was necessary to describe the relation of the day to the sixteenth in particular ; the circumstance of its so falling out might give rise to the denomination of it in question*.

* This word δευτερόπρωτος, in its application to a certain day of the week, and that a sabbath, is so peculiar to the Gospel of St. Luke, that perhaps nothing can be produced, from any other quarter, as parallel to it, except

an obscure allusion to a σάββατον, τὸ λεγόμενον πρῶτον—which occurs in a fragment of the Prædicatio Petri, apud Clementem Alexandrinum, vi. 5. 760. 20. I have had occasion to quote this passage elsewhere.

Nor is it any objection that the miracle, related John v. 1—16, which I supposed to be performed at

We have observed that the persignification of *δευτερόπρωτος* is *second-first*—or *first-second*; and difficult as it may appear to assign a reason, why one and the same day should be called both *first* and *second*, or *second* and *first*—it is not perhaps impossible.

It appears from Leviticus xxiii. 10—16 that the reckoning of the days of Pentecost or the feast of Weeks, was to *begin* on the *morrow* after the sabbath, and to *end* on the *morrow* after the sabbath; in which case, there were forty-nine full days, or seven complete weeks, from the first of these days to the last. It was to begin and to end, too, at the same time in each instance; that is, with morning sacrifice on the first day, and with morning sacrifice on the fiftieth day. It is manifest, then, that each of these days, like every other Jewish *νυχθήμερον*, would consist of a period of four and twenty hours; which we may call, in contradistinction to the ordinary *νυχθήμερα* of the regular course of the month, the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, or the feast of Weeks: see Deuteronomy, xvi. 10.

There can be little question that the Jews would be careful to keep an exact account of these *νυχθήμερα*; beginning at the time specified by the Law, and ending at the time specified by it: because one of their principal national solemnities depended upon it, which it would have been as much a breach of the Law to celebrate one day before its proper time, as one day after

it. The feast of Pentecost could not be lawfully celebrated either earlier or later than the morning of the fiftieth day, reckoned from the sixteenth of Nisan.

Now it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that an ordinary *νυχθήμερον*, in the regular course of the Jewish months, consisted of an evening and a morning; beginning at sunset and ending at sunset. This was specially appointed to be the rule of reckoning with respect to the day of Atonement in particular, by Leviticus xxiii. 32: and we know it to have been the case with the sabbath and the rest of the days of the week in general. But the extraordinary *νυχθήμερα* of the feast of Weeks, for the time that they lasted, it is manifest from what has been premised, would consist of a morning and an evening—beginning at sunrise and ending at sunrise. It would follow consequently that no one *νυχθήμερον* of the feast of Weeks could possibly coincide with any one *νυχθήμερον* in the ordinary course of the month; but that each *νυχθήμερον* of the feast of Weeks would bisect two *νυχθήμερα* of the days of the month, one immediately before, another immediately after itself: consisting of the morning of the *νυχθήμερον* before it, and the evening of the *νυχθήμερον* after it. In like manner each of the ordinary *νυχθήμερα* would bisect two of the extraordinary, for the time being; one immediately before it, and another immediately after it; taking in the evening of the one before, and the morning of the one after

this Passover, was yet performed on the sabbath. That miracle might be performed on the fifteenth of Nisan,

it. The seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan, for instance, would bisect the first and the second of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost : consisting of the evening of the first, and of the morning of the second, of those *νυχθήμερα* in particular.

Now let us suppose it necessary to express either of these successions of *νυχθήμερα* in terms of the correlative succession, proceeding parallel with itself—for the time being—yet distinct from it. Let us suppose it necessary, for instance, to express the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan in terms which should shew its relation to the corresponding *νυχθήμερα* of the feast of Weeks. I would challenge any one to tax his ingenuity to express it by a more appropriate and significant name, than this which St. Luke has chosen, to convey the peculiar notion of second-first, or first-second. For this is exactly the definition of the 17th *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan, in terms of the correlative succession of the *νυχθήμερα* of the feast of Weeks. The seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan was precisely that which was made up of the second and first, or first and second of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost—which was made up of the evening of the first, and of the morning of the second of those *νυχθήμερα* in particular ; and therefore might be called, with reference to the order and series of those *νυχθήμερα*, either second-first, or first-second, indifferently.

It is to be observed too that the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of

Nisan was the first in the ordinary succession of the days of the month, which admitted of being expressed in terms of the correlative succession of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost ; that is, expressed entire and total, as every Jewish *νυχθήμερον* required to be. The sixteenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan could not be so expressed entire and total : for though it coincided with the morning of the first of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost—it did not coincide with the evening : it did not coincide with any one of those *νυχθήμερα* entire, or any two of them in part : it coincided only with the first of the number in part.

If now the course of events were so to have been ordered by Providence, that in this particular year of our Saviour's ministry an incident should fall out, involving the question of the right of plucking and eating the standing corn on any day of the week in general, and on the sabbath-day in particular ; on what *νυχθήμερον* of the civil Jewish reckoning of time could such an incident happen, with the greatest likelihood of involving both these questions ? We may boldly answer, on the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan—and that *νυχθήμερον*, a sabbatic one. Before the sixteenth of Nisan, to pluck and eat the standing corn would have been a breach of the Law on any day of the week in general ; and after the sixteenth of Nisan, to pluck and eat the standing corn would have been, or appeared to have been, a breach of the

and even on the twenty-first; and yet would be performed on a sabbath. It is my opinion however that

Law on the sabbath-day in particular. Now we see that, in this particular instance, no exception was taken against the act of plucking the corn in general; whence we may fairly conclude that the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan was arrived at least; and we see from the kind of exception that was taken to the act performed upon this day, as well as from the evangelist's description of it, that the day itself was a sabbath; and therefore if the day was the seventeenth of Nisan, the seventeenth of Nisan was a sabbath. On this day, then, it was so ordered by Providence that an incident should happen, involving the right both of plucking and eating the standing corn, on any day at all, and of plucking and eating it, on the sabbath-day in particular.

I think this coincidence was competent to have determined St. Luke to make choice of a designation for the day in question, which should define both its place in the order of the days of the week, and its relation to the order of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost—whether any such mode of describing the days of the month was otherwise in vogue among the Jews of his time, or

not. Such a designation is *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον*, or *σάββατον πρωτοδεύτερον*—to define the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan, and that *νυχθήμερον* a sabbath—a designation than which none can be conceived more fitly adapted to explain both why no offence should be taken at the act performed on this day in general, and so much offence be taken at its being performed on this day in particular ^e.

Yet is there, in my opinion at least, no reason to suppose that this mode of designating the ordinary *νυχθήμερα* of the month in terms of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, for the time being—might not be in use among the Jews of this period. If a reckoning was to be kept of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, and kept with all regard to care and exactness—there must have been some mode of keeping that reckoning—and keeping it in terms of the ordinary computation of the succession of the days of the month. And what so natural and obvious, yet so simple and perspicuous, as this, of which St. Luke's *δευτερόπρωτος* applied to the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan—furnishes an example? Beginning with the seventeenth *νυχθήμερον* of Nisan—the first which

^e Should any one inquire why the evangelist chose to call the day in question *δευτερόπρωτον*, and not *πρωτοδεύτερον*—both apparently meaning the same thing—the answer, as it seems to me, is that St. Luke preferred the former because the incident itself happened on the *morning* of the sabbath—which was also the *morning* of the *second* of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, not upon the *evening* of the sabbath—which was also the *evening* of the *first* of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost. It is manifest that this incident might have happened in the evening, after sunset, and yet would have happened on the sabbath. In this case, however, it appears to me that St. Luke would have called the sabbath *πρωτοδεύτερον*—just on the same principle, that, as the matter actually fell out, he calls it *δευτερόπρωτον*.

it was performed on the *tenth*: which, when Nisan 14 coincided with March 29, must have coincided with

could be described in terms of the correlative *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost—and calling this *δευτερό-πρωτον*, or *πρωτοδεύτερον*—they might pass to the eighteenth, and call that, on the same principle *τριτοδεύτερον*, or *δευτερότριτον*: then to the nineteenth, calling that *τεταρτότριτον*, or *τριτοτέταρτον*—and so on, down to the sixth *νυχθήμερον* of Sivan, with which the feast of Pentecost always coincided; calling this by a name compounded of the forty-ninth and the fiftieth of the *νυχθήμερα* of Pentecost, *πεντηκοστοτεσσαρακοστέννατον*, — or *τεσσαρακοστέννατοπεντήκοστον*. And though this nomenclature may sound harshly, in such peculiar instances as these, yet even in these the principle is the same, as in the simpler. The composition of these epithets is analogous to that of *δευτερό-πρωτος*, or *πρωτοδέυτερος*: and they express the same thing of the sixth of Sivan, or last of the *νυχθήμερα* of the feast of Weeks, which those did of the seventeenth of Nisan—or the first. It is to be observed, however, that the Jews appear to have called the last of these days simply *πεντηκοστή*, sc. *ἡμέρα*—as the fiftieth in the order of succession among these *νυχθήμερα*, and well known to coincide with the morning of the sixth *νυχθήμερον* of Sivan^f.

Notwithstanding the length to which these remarks have extended, yet, allowing for argument's sake, the truth of the above explanation—I cannot help observing how important it is to an Harmony of the Gos-

pels, and to the question of the length of our Saviour's ministry: how important it is too to that computation of Jewish Passovers, and to that peculiar rule in determining the coincidence of particular days of the month with days of the week, which has been hitherto followed in the course of the present work, and will still be followed to the end of it. For let it be granted that by the use of this word, *δευτερόπρωτος*, in reference to a certain day, St. Luke has only not specified the seventeenth of Nisan by name; and that seventeenth a sabbath. It follows that we have evidence of a Passover, in this part of St. Luke's Gospel, which it were easy to shew must have been at least a year after the Passover, when our Saviour began his ministry; and two years at least before the Passover, when he ended it. It follows also that we have strong presumptive evidence of an attendance of our Saviour at this Passover, and consequently at Jerusalem, which there would be every reason to conclude the same with the attendance specified John v. 1. It follows too, that if the seventeenth of Nisan in this year is rightly to be fixed to a Saturday, the fourteenth of Nisan is rightly to be fixed to a Wednesday: and therefore the year being U. C. 781, A. D. 28, we have rightly calculated the Paschal full moon to March 29, and March 29 to a Wednesday: for in that case, Nisan 14 coincided with March 29, and Nisan 17

^f See Josephus, Ant. iii. x. 6.

March 25. And when March 29 was Wednesday, March 25 was Saturday.

Those who are curious to see the explanations of the word in question, proposed by the ancient commentators, may consult Epiphanius or Chrysostom ^g. Suidas has preserved one of the number, taken from the *Epistolæ* of Isidore of Pelusium, which approaches so near to the interpretation of Scaliger, that it might almost have suggested it. Σάββατον δὲ δευτερόπρωτον, ἐπειδὴ δεύτερον μὲν ἦν τοῦ Πάσχα· πρῶτον δὲ τῶν Ἀζύμων ^h *.

with April 1: and Nisan 17 being a Saturday, so was April 1. But the tables of the solar cycle would shew April 1, A. D. 28, on a Thursday: and March 29 on a Monday: neither of which things could possibly be the case, if so be that Nisan 17 coincided with Saturday—and Nisan 14 with the date of the mean full moon that year, March 29. And April 1, A. D. 28, being a Saturday, April 1, A. D. 30, would necessarily be a Monday; and April 5 a Friday: a very important conclusion—for Friday A. D. 30 was the day on which our Saviour suffered—and if Friday, A. D. 30, coincided with April 5, April 5, A. D. 30, was the day on which our Saviour suffered. The Tables shew April 5, A. D. 30, on a Wednesday: which could not possibly be the case, unless April 1, A. D. 28, had been a Thursday. And there is this further reason why April 5, A. D. 30, must have been the day on which our Saviour suffered, that is, Friday in Passion week, that Nisan 14 coincided with April

5, A. D. 30, on the same principle that Nisan 14 coincided with March 29, A. D. 28: and Nisan 14, A. D. 30, we have every reason to conclude, was the day on which our Saviour suffered. Sed de his satis.

* In the judgment of St. Ambrose, the *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον* is a description of the seventh day or Jewish sabbath, after the resurrection of our Lord had consecrated the eighth day, or dies Dominica, to take precedence, in honour and sanctity, of the seventh day, or ancient legal sabbath. For thus he writes, *Operum* i. 935. E—936. E. in *Psalmum* xlvii. §. 1: Quid est enim secunda sabbati; nisi Dominica dies quæ sabbatum sequebatur? dies autem sabbati erat dierum ordine posterior, sanctificatione Legis anterior. sed ubi finis Legis advenit, qui est Christus Jesus . . . et resurrectione sua octavam sanctificavit; cœpit eadem prima esse, quæ octava est, et octava quæ prima: habens ex numeri ordine prærogativam, et ex resurrectione Domini sanctita-

^g Epiphanius, *Operum* i. 158, 159. Ebionæi xxxii: 452, 453. Alogi xxxi. Chrysostom, *Operum* vii. 431. D. in *Matthæum* Homilia xxxix. 1. Theophylact, *Operum* i. 309. D. E. in *Lucam*, vi. ^h Σάββατον. Isidore, *Epp. Libb.* iii. cx.

However much these opinions may differ from each other, yet they concur in placing the time of this sabbath about a Passover. The material fact itself proves thus much, if no more. The disciples could not have plucked ripe corn, if ripe corn was not to be found; but ripe corn would not be to be found except at barley-harvest or at wheat-harvest; that is, at the Passover or at Pentecost. Respecting the ripeness of the corn, that is, barley, at the first of these periods, Josephus furnishes two parallel instancesⁱ. Nor would any one, at either of these periods, have presumed to eat of the corn, unless it had been previously consecrated to his use by the usual offering of the first-

tem. unde et in Evangelio legimus δευτερόπρωτον sabbatum, quod latine dicitur secundo-primum. ubi enim Dominica dies cœpit præcellere, qua Dominus resurrexit; sabbatum quod primum erat secundum haberi cœpit a primo. prima enim requies cessavit, secunda successit. On this principle, the word would still denote the Jewish sabbath; but as now a *second* sabbath in comparison of a *first*—that is, as the legal sabbath in comparison of the dies Dominica, or Christian sabbath, as now a sabbath as much as the ancient Jewish sabbath; and if so, a first sabbath in reference to a second, because the first in the order of the days of the week in reference to the seventh in the same. Compare with the above, the commentary on the place, i. 1363. C—F. in Luc. Comm. lib. v. §. 31: Mire tamen secundum Lucam, secundo-primum non primo-secundum sabbatum dixit; δευτερόπρωτον enim scriptum est.

preferri enim debuit quod præcellit. secundum ideo, quia primum ante ex Lege præcessit, in quo etiam pœna præscripta est, si quis operetur: primum autem ideo, quia sabbatum illud ex Lege solutum est, quod erat primum; et hoc primum factum est, quod secundo est constitutum. He then proceeds to illustrate his meaning by 1 Cor. xv. 45. 47, in the opposition between the first and second Adam: after which he continues, Prælatum utique secundum primo; ille enim causa mortis, hic vitæ. sic et secundo-primum sabbatum dicitur: secundum juxta numerum, primum juxta operationis gratiam; melius est enim sabbatum quo impunitas datur, quam quo pœna præscribitur. Here also the day is still supposed to be the sabbath; the question is only why, under the circumstances of the case, it should have been described as the sabbath *second-first*.

ⁱ Ant. Jud. xiv. ii. 2. Bell. iv. vii. 2.

fruits^k; for, says Josephus, καὶ τότε λοιπὸν δημοσίᾳ ἔξεστι πᾶσι καὶ ἰδίᾳ θερίζειν^l; but not before. The feast of Pentecost I consider to be quite out of the question in the present instance: it must therefore have been at the Passover.

Nor is it any objection that ripe corn is mentioned here, and yet, as we endeavoured to prove elsewhere^m, the time of this transaction was the middle of a year of rest. The corn in question was such as, even in a year of that kind, might be produced of itself; for something invariably sprang up from the relics of the last year's harvest; which was eminently too the right of the public, or of any one rather than the owners of the soil in particularⁿ. And this is the best reason (if any reason, beyond the general permission applicable to such cases, already conceded by the law^o, is considered to be necessary) which can be assigned why the disciples of our Lord ate freely of it, as they went along.

Moreover, by the seventh and ninth of what are called in the rabbinical writers^p the constitutions of Joshua; in other words, by what was from time immemorial the custom of the land; it appears that, except during a sabbatic year, when every field necessarily lay fallow, travelling through corn fields for convenience sake never would have been allowed, until after reaping-time and up to seed-time; much less through standing corn, or fields as yet uncut. Maimonides observes^q, Non constituebatur annus intercalaris...anno sabbatico. cum enim illæ, quæ e terris incultis sponte sua nascerentur, fruges publici juris essent, si annus augeretur solido mense, non liceret reperire,

^k Lev. xxiii. 14. Josh. v. 11. ^l Ant. Jud. iii. x. 5. ^m Supra, Dissertation xxii. ⁿ Exod. xxiii. 10, 11. Lev. xxv. 5, 6. Cf. Philo, ii. 289. l. 10—42. De Septenario et Festis Diebus. ^o Deut. xxiii. 24, 25. Jos. Ant. Jud. iv. viii. 21. ^p Maimonides, De Primitiis Animantium, iii. 6. Annot. : Reland, Palestina, i. cap. 39. 261. Cf. Codex Pseudepigraphus, clxvii. 874. ^q De Ratione Intercalandi, iv. 15.

unde Deo libaretur ille, qui præscribitur a Lege, manipulus, atque panes illi duo: which, if correct, proves all that we have been contending for; both that there were spontaneous productions of the soil even in a sabbatic year; that these were the public property; and that these, whether of barley or of wheat, required still to be consecrated in such a year as well as in any other, before they could be touched.

If then our Saviour was now at Jerusalem, attending on the Paschal feast, and not yet preparing to return into Galilee; or if he was merely walking a sabbath-day's journey during the Paschal week; still by the next sabbath-day he might be again in Galilee. The Paschal feast would expire on the twenty-first of Nisan; which if the seventeenth coincided with Saturday would fall on the Wednesday: nor would it be impossible that in two days' time afterwards Jesus might be returned to Galilee. The next event^r therefore, which also happened on a sabbath, might happen on the following sabbath; and certainly on the next but one: and this conjecture is further confirmed by the consideration of the place where it happened. For Mark iii. 1, compared with i. 21, and the use of the article, in the mention of this synagogue ἡ συναγωγή, by all the evangelists; (which use shews it to have been the synagogue most commonly frequented by our Lord; or the single synagogue of some place which had no other synagogue but that:) and especially the reference to the lake so directly after^s, to which he is supposed to retire from wheresoever he was: prove almost to a demonstration that this place could be only Capernaum, and the synagogue in question only that of Capernaum. By the time of the miracle now performed,

^r Matt. xii. 9—14. Mark iii. 1—6. Luke vi. 6—11.

^s Mark iii. 7.

Jesus consequently had got back to Capernaum; though he might only just have done so. I shall pause therefore here, to make a few observations.

In the account of the miracle which ensued, the supplementary character of the two latter evangelists, in relation to the first, is strikingly illustrated. St. Mark supplies matter not to be found in St. Matthew; and St. Luke not only does the same, but, if I am not much mistaken, something else: which may be thus explained.

It appears from St. Matthew that the observers of our Lord, whom St. Luke shews to have been some of the Scribes and Pharisees, suspecting his intention to heal the man, anticipated him by a question—Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath-day? to which however he made no answer at the time, except by commanding the man to stand forth. When the man had so done, then according to St. Luke he addressed them in the following words; I will ask you a certain thing: in which and in those which follow, there is a reference, first, to the question which they had just put to him; and secondly, to the *animus* with which they had put it: and their purpose, as implied by this *animus*, in respect of himself, is made the ground of the vindication of his own, with respect to the man; both being understood in reference to the sabbath-day. He himself was designing to do good, they to do evil; he to preserve a life, they to destroy one; both upon the sabbath-day. The passage then ought to be rendered in conformity to a well known ellipsis in Greek construction, of which numerous examples may be produced from these evangelists themselves^t: I will ask you a certain thing. Is it more lawful to do good on

^t Luke xv. 7. xviii. 14. Matt. xviii. 8, 9. Mark ix. 43. 45. 47.

the sabbath-day, or to do evil? Is it more lawful to save a life, or to destroy one?

The answer to this question was the answer to their own; and this question was addressed to the consciences of the parties. They made him no reply: there ensued consequently a pause—during which he might look round upon them in anger, mixed with concern for the obduracy of their hearts, according to St. Mark; and then subjoin the words, which close the account in St. Matthew, and have nothing to answer to them in St. Mark or in St. Luke; or he might do the reverse; for either arrangement may hold good. Yet in this answer, according to St. Matthew, there is a critical coincidence with the preceding account by St. Mark or by St. Luke, which justifies our position of it. The question of our Lord's adversaries was, Is it lawful to heal (*θεραπεύειν*) on the sabbath-day? our Lord's reply is, It is lawful to do well (*καλῶς ποιεῖν*) on the sabbath-day. Whence this change in terms? because his own expressions, *ἀγαθοποιῆσαι* and *κακοποιῆσαι*, which were tantamount to *καλῶς ποιεῖν* and *κακῶς ποιεῖν*, had been only just pronounced, and were still uppermost in his memory. To return then from this digression *.

The effect of the miracle, as we had occasion to observe elsewhere ^u, was a specific design of the Pharisees, in which the Herodians also joined, against our Saviour's life. The mention of this last party, if they were, as their name implies, the followers or partizans

* Hieronymus, iv. Pars i. 47. *ad calcem*, in Matt. xii: In the Gospel according to the Ebionites, or the Nazarenes, translated by Jerome, the man with the withered hand was described

as cœmentarius, istiusmodi vocabus auxilium precans: Cœmentarius eram, manibus victum quæritans: precor te Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos.

^u Supra, 256, Dissertation xxiii. Part i.

of Herod the tetrarch, religious or political, seems to intimate that Jesus was now in the dominions of Herod; and consequently that it was expedient or necessary for the Pharisees, in order to give effect to their own designs, to interest in their behalf a sect who were peculiarly his creatures. For the opinions however of the ancients concerning this sect, we may refer to the authorities in the margin ^v.

In consequence of this conspiracy, which notwithstanding its secrecy was known to our Saviour by his supernatural discernment of the thoughts, St. Matthew, exemplifying the fulfilment of prophecy ^w in the meek and inoffensive demeanour of the Christ, relates that he withdrew from thence, followed by the multitudes and healing them all. St. Mark is more explicit, and shews that he retired in the direction of the lake, and that the place of his abode during his absence was the vicinity of the lake ^x.

To this absence, then, I think we may assign the duration of a partial circuit, now begun, but confined to the neighbourhood of the lake; which yet might occupy the time until the arrival of the next feast of Pentecost, May 19, a period, at the utmost, of only five weeks, or a month. For first, the cause of the departure from Capernaum was such as to warrant the expectation that Jesus would stay some time away; and St. Matthew's application of the prophecy in question to it implies the same thing: secondly, the multitudes by which he was attended at the close of the circuit, according to the representation of St. Mark, consisting of such numbers, and from such distant regions, could not be assembled about him all at once: thirdly,

^v Epiphanius, *Operum* i. 45. Chrysostom, *Operum* vii. 687. A. B. in *Matthæum* Homilia lxx. 1. Theophylact, *Operum* i. 119. B. In *Matt.* xxii: *Ibid.* 186. D. E. In *Marc.* iii: *Ibid.* 211. B. In *Marc.* viii: 236. C. In *Marc.* xii.

^w Isaiah xlii. 1—4.

^x iii. 7—12.

the injunction that a small vessel (πλοιάριον) should constantly be in waiting upon him, προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ, specified by the same evangelist also, appears a decisive intimation that he was all the while in the vicinity of the lake of Galilee. The vessel itself was one of that description, which Josephus shews to have been abundantly numerous on the lake of Tiberias; so much so that, on a certain occasion, he himself speedily collected together as many as two hundred and thirty^y; each of which required at least four persons to man it, and was capable of carrying sixteen, or more, with ease: so that our Saviour and his usual attendants, when those became the Twelve apostles, would constitute about their ordinary complement. The purpose for which this vessel was retained proves that it was not wanted at all times, but only occasionally; that is, when the importunity of the people, bringing their sick friends, or infirm persons of any kind, to press upon our Lord became too great; or when he was desirous, as we find him at other times desirous, to address them from the sea, and not from the land.

This circuit then would extend along the land of Genesaret^z, described above; towards the southern extremity of the lake. The lake itself, Josephus describes as follows^a:

The lake is called Gennesar after the neighbouring region; and though it is forty stades in breadth, and one hundred and forty in length, still it is both sweet, and very fit for drinking. . . . It is clear also, terminating on every side in a sandy beach....and there are species of fish in it, which both in taste and in appearance excel such as are to be found elsewhere. The Jordan divides it in sunder....Beginning its course...

^y Bell. ii. xxi. 8—9. Vide also Mark iv. 36. John vi. 23.

^z Mark vi. 53.

^a Bell. iii. x. 7.

this river passes through the marshes and quagmires of the lake Semechonitis ; after which, having travelled through another hundred and twenty stades, it cuts the lake of Gennesar right through, just after passing by the city Julias ; and then, traversing a considerable tract of country which is desert, it discharges itself into the lake Asphaltites.

Ergo ubi prima convallium fuit occasio, in lacum se fundit, (Jordanes,) quem plures Genesaram vocant, XVI. mille passuum longitudinis, VI. mille latitudinis^b. The lake Asphaltites was three hundred stades distant from Jerusalem, or from the frontiers of Judæa^c ; and the Aulon, which was the name of the desert region, through which the Jordan flowed, between this lake and the lake of Tiberias, was two hundred and thirty stades in length.

In the course of the circuit, Magdala, which as I conceive lay on the western, or on the south-western side of the lake, might be visited ; and among those out of whom demons are said to have been cast, Mary of Magdala, mentioned for the first time not long after^d, might be one. There is no proof, however, nor any reason to suppose, that our Lord crossed the lake, or passed as yet either into Decapolis, or into Peræa.

The last event which took place upon this circuit, just before our Lord returned to Capernaum, and probably when the feast of Pentecost was at hand ; was the ordination of the Twelve Apostles^e ; where St. Luke rejoins St. Mark, though St. Matthew, for reasons assigned elsewhere^f, omits this fact altogether. The circumstances of the ordination, the sermon which followed upon it^g, its distinctness from the former in St. Matthew^h, will

^b Pliny, H. N. v. 15.

^c Ant. Jud. ix. i. 2. xv. vi. 2.

^d Luke viii. 1, 2.

^e Mark iii. 13—19. αὐτόν.

Luke vi. 12—16.

^f Vol. i. Dissertation iii.

^g Luke vi. 17. to the end.

^h v. i.—viii. i.

be considered by themselves hereafter. The προσευχή τοῦ Θεοῦ, alluded to by St. Lukeⁱ, may be understood either of earnest and fervent prayer, or of some place of prayer, or Proseucha. Josephus calls the Proseucha of Tiberias μέγιστον οἶκημα^k, and Epiphanius describes one, in his own time, near Sychar, as follows^l: There is also at Sicima in what is now called Neapolis, about two miles distant, without the city in the plain ground, an house of prayer, or oratory; in shape resembling a theatre—so much in the open air and in a free space does it stand—built by the Samaritans, in their imitation of all the customs of the Jews.

The ordination took place as soon as it was day; the sermon, consecutively delivered, must have been over soon after; and then Jesus returned to Capernaum^m; where, either when he was still on the way to his usual place of abode in that city, or soon after his arrival there, and certainly in the course of the same day, he received the application of the centurionⁿ. On the following day, probably early in the morning, he set out to Nain; concerning which place Jerome observes^o, Naim . . . usque hodie in secundo milliario Thabor montis ostenditur, contra meridiem, juxta Ændor*.

The time of the year when Jesus set out on this journey, was about the period of the feast of Pentecost, May 19. The distance of Nain from Capernaum was not more than might be accomplished by an ordinary day's journey of twenty-five or twenty-six Roman miles^p; and, as he is said to have gone thither

* Origen, ii. 775. B. Selecta in Psalmum lxxxviii, places Naim under, or upon, mount Hermon, mentioned in that Psalm.

ⁱ Ch. vi. 12. ^k Vita, 54. ^l Operum i. 1068. A. Massaliani i. ^m Luke vii. 1. ⁿ Luke vii. 2—10. Matt. viii. 5—13. ^o Operum ii. 470. *ad calcem*: De Situ et Nominibus. ^p Reland, Palæstina, ii. cap. xi. 497. iii. 904.

expressly, it is most probable that he went thither in one day. On that supposition he would arrive in the evening; and the evening being the usual time of burial among the Jews, it would be the less surprising that, as he approached to the gates of the city, he should have fallen in with the funeral procession of the widow's son^q. In towns surrounded by walls, observes Maimonides^r, Nullus humatur homo mortuus, nisi septem optimates jubeant, vel civitas omnis. Now, according to Josephus^s, the following was one of the humane laws of Moses: *πάσι δὲ τοῖς παριούσι θαπτομένου τινὸς, καὶ συνελθεῖν καὶ συναποδύρασθαι ἐποίησε νόμιμον*. Independent then of the natural impulse of pity, which is so beautifully and movingly illustrated by our Lord's conduct on this occasion, we should need no other explanation of it than the acknowledged existence of such a custom; nor could we assign a better reason for the performance of the miracle which ensued. To restore the only child of this distressed and widowed mother to life was the fittest consolation, which such an one as our Lord could bestow upon her.

The rumour of the miracle, which was obviously the first of its kind, being disseminated through the surrounding regions, produced among its other effects the celebrated message of John^t. Concerning the place where that message was received by our Saviour, there seems to be little doubt that he was still in Nain; but with regard to the quarter, whence John might send it, there can never be the same certainty. It was sent by him, it is true, from prison; and Josephus, as we shall see elsewhere^u, supposes him to have been both originally imprisoned and ultimately

^q Luke vii. 11—17.
Apionem, ii. 26.
the Appendix.

^r De Edificio Templi, vii. 13.
^t Luke vii. 18—35. Matt. xi. 2—30.

^s Contra
^u Vide

put to death, in Herod's castle of Machærus; the distance of which from Nain was probably a three days' journey. The news of the miracle, however, was carried to John by some of his own disciples; who being, as we may conjecture, Galileans, and having access to him in prison, might make him acquainted with it even at that distance, in a few days after its performance. Nor if the report of the miracle was diffused throughout all Judæa^v, could it fail to pass into Pæ-ræa. We have only to suppose that Jesus remained long enough in Nain, even after the miracle, both for the news of that event to reach John, and for the arrival of his message in consequence of it. And this, it is obvious, might not be more than a week.

The answer of our Lord to the messengers of the Baptist was returned on the same day when they arrived; and either directly after it, or on the next day, he was invited by a certain Pharisee, named Simon, to eat bread in his house^w. The nature of this meal is not specified; but, if it was the noonday's, and the day itself was not a sabbath, its time would be about the fifth hour of the day. During the entertainment, a woman in *the city*^x, (so she is described,) who had been, and (in allusion to her former mode of life) who was still a sinner; came and anointed the feet of Jesus as he lay at meat. This allusion to the city of which, as it is implied, she was either a native or an inhabitant, can be understood of no city but that which was twice mentioned before, viz. Nain^y. It proves consequently that our Lord was still in Nain: it proves also, that this penitent sinner could not be Mary Magdalene, who was either a native or an inhabitant of a very different place, Magdala. Nor can the reference

^v Luke vii. 17.

^w Luke vii. 36. to the end.

^x Ib. 37.

^y Ib. 11, 12.

which follows next, ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς^z, with the ellipsis of χρόνον, be understood of any thing but the whole course of proceedings since the first day of the arrival at Nain^a; not merely since the day of this one among the subsequent incidents which happened there, the unction in the house of the Pharisee.

It seems to be implied, therefore, that our Lord made some stay at Nain; and to judge from the sequel, his object in going thither was to commence a circuit of Galilee; for which purpose, it was conveniently situated; lying almost in the centre of the country. That such a circuit is represented as beginning from the city where the last event took place, and as continued thenceforward by Jesus, travelling up and down, (such is the meaning of the term διώδευε,) through cities and towns in order, accompanied by the Twelve, and by certain women whose names are mentioned not only because they attended upon our Lord, but also because they ministered, of their substance, to his wants; and that the business of this circuit was the same as before, to preach, or publish the tidings of the kingdom: is placed beyond a question by Luke viii. 1—3. It is clear, also, that it did not cease until it was terminated at Capernaum; for the next event^b, the delivery of the parable of the sower, was certainly posterior to the return to Capernaum, and yet was produced, according to the same testimony, in part, by the resort of the multitude from every city; such as might be the effect of the circuit itself.

The fact of this circuit, it is true, rests upon the single authority of St. Luke. St. Mark, after the ordination of the Twelve, which certainly took place *out* of Capernaum, adds, καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον^c: which

^z Ch. viii. 1.^a Ch. vii. 11.^b Luke viii. 4—8.^c Ch. iii. 19.

would still be true, though, since the ordination, Jesus and the Twelve had both visited and left Capernaum, and had been any where else; provided that they returned thither again, before what begins to be next related. There would be, on this principle, an interruption in the continuity, but no impeachment of the entire truth and correctness of St. Mark's narrative. Indeed, the very particular which it mentions next—*καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος*—contains an intimation that, since iii. 7—12, (when our Lord was described as surrounded by immense multitudes, and from every part, as it was,) he must have been somewhere else; during which interval he had ceased to be attended by those multitudes; and being now come back to Capernaum was beginning to be surrounded by new.

St. Mark's omission of the intermediate circuit, is in reality (as we observed elsewhere^d) the natural consequence of its omission by St. Matthew; for which omission likewise some reasons were there alleged: while its omission by both might be the very motive to produce its express mention by St. Luke. A similar omission, as we shall see hereafter, produces a similar supplement on another occasion, of even greater extent than this. Nor will any one, perhaps, be disposed to deny that, if the course of events from Mark ii. 23, to iii. 19, be carefully compared with the similar course of events from Mark iii. 19, to vi. 56, which brings his account to the close of our Saviour's second year; we may be led to conclude that there must have been an hiatus of at least four months in duration; which hiatus could not have come any where before or after Mark iii. 19, but might critically fall out there: if we suppose the intermediate circuit in question, between *ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν*, and *καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον*.

^d Vol. i. Dissertations i. and iii.

I assume, then, that the close of this circuit is indicated here, by the return of our Lord and his disciples to Capernaum, now alluded to: and from this point of time, as the sequel demonstrates, must be dated also the course of proceedings at Matt. xii. 22. The reference however in the *τότε*, at the beginning of that verse, cannot be understood of what went before. It must be understood solely of what comes after. For it was shewn, xii. 15, that our Lord left Capernaum; and it is shewn, xii. 46, that he was there again; and yet no mention of his return is interposed. The notice of time then in question is to be construed according to the idiom of this evangelist in other like instances; viz. as an admonition to the reader, to attend to what is about to be related, and to the course of events thenceforward; but nothing more.

We possess therefore at Luke viii. 1—3, an evident proof of another circuit of Galilee; which set out from Capernaum, before it began at Nain; and after visiting city and village in order terminated again at Capernaum: on all which accounts it must be pronounced a general circuit; and as only one other such has yet been ascertained before it, a *general* circuit, the second of its kind. The time taken up by it, on the same principle as before, would be three or four months at least; and if it began about the feast of Pentecost in our Lord's second year, (which was May 19,) it would be over about the feast of Tabernacles, (which began September 23.) And this conclusion may be further confirmed as follows:

I. The parable of the sower, delivered soon after; though probably not before the close of the feast, nor consequently before the first week in our October at the earliest; may well be presumed to contain a reference to the labours of the field at the time, not only

because the season, if it was what we suppose it, obviously permitted of this, but especially, because the past year, dated from seed-time to seed-time, had actually been a sabbatic year. When this was over, the labours of agriculture would be renewed, at their accustomed period, even with more activity than ever. If so, it is a natural presumption that the parable was delivered at seed-time; and therefore after (but probably not long after) the feast of Tabernacles at least.

II. The storm on the lake of Galilee, which happened in the evening of the same day, has been conjectured to intimate that the autumnal equinox was either arrived or past; both which things would be the case after the expiration of the feast of Tabernacles, October 1. A similar phenomenon occurs at the time of the ensuing Passover; and consequently about as much later than the vernal equinox: and these two instances are sufficient to intimate the time when they happened: as the weather on the sea of Tiberias, at other times so settled and regular, would naturally become disturbed or tempestuous only at the spring and autumnal periods of the year.

III. The most decisive argument in proof of the fact, however, appears to me to be supplied by Mark iii. 22, in the mention of the Scribes, who are said to have come down from Jerusalem. Theophylact observes^e, εἰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ χῶραι εἶχον Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους, ἀλλ' οἱ ἐντιμότεροι ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἦσαν διὸ καὶ οὗτοι ἐφθόνουν μάλιστα. It is very true, as St. Luke proves^f, that Scribes and probably Pharisees were to be found in every part of the country, as well as in Jerusalem; but the presence of Scribes from Jerusalem, who came down on purpose upon this occasion, is intended of something more than usual. After a certain time;

^e Operum i. 77. D. Comm. in Matt. xv.

^f Ch. v. 17.

which I believe was John v. 1, the time of the second Passover; whenever this circumstance is expressly mentioned, there is reason to conclude that it implies a feast to have recently transpired; and a feast which had passed without being attended by our Saviour. After such times therefore more especially, these men appear to have been sent down from Jerusalem expressly to inquire after Jesus; to discover where he was; and to watch and report upon his conduct. The second feast of Tabernacles was one of the solemnities which, as it has been shewn elsewhere, our Lord could not personally have attended: accordingly, Scribes and Pharisees from Jerusalem are perceived immediately afterwards to be in his company. The third Passover is another feast, of which it is still more certain that he did not keep it in person; and directly after that also the presence of the same description of persons and from the same quarter, tempting him with insidious questions, is found to be specified. It strengthens the argument, that they are seen in each instance to be attending upon him in Capernaum, our Lord's stated place of residence in general; and as it would seem, during the intervals of the feasts which he had not gone up to in person, more particularly. If the same intimations do not recur at any such periods *after* the third Passover; it is because our Lord either attended the feasts himself; or was travelling before and after them; or purposely kept aloof from Capernaum.

With the return to Capernaum on this occasion, the three evangelical accounts coincide, and for a time go on together. Yet the length of the stay there, as far as it is related in detail, I think it is possible to demonstrate, did not exceed two full days; the cause of so short a residence being, in all probability, the first

instance of the blasphemy against the Spirit on one of those days, and its repetition, or something very like its repetition, by the same persons (those, in each instance, who had previously come down to watch our Lord) on the next. With a view to this demonstration, it will be necessary to harmonize briefly the several accounts in somewhat of a particular detail; by doing which, I shall shew that Jesus visited Gadara, for the first time in the course of his ministry, on the first of the two days, but did not return to Capernaum until the next.

I. The second general circuit of Galilee being concluded, our Saviour and his disciples return to Capernaum; and there *ἔρχονται εἰς οἶκον* ^g.

II. Besides the multitudes who would naturally accompany him wheresoever he went, his return to Capernaum, and the news of his being resident there, might collect more. But between the return and the resort of the multitude afresh to him (*συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος* ^h), we have supposed it possible that the feast of Tabernacles intervened. The people who had hitherto attended on our Saviour, and perhaps his disciples themselves; (though that is by no means certain;) all, in short, but himself, as it may be presumed, would go up to the feast: and the resort next specified would be strictly a *new* resort. To all these the ministerial attentions of our Lord were indefatigable; so much so, that neither he nor his disciples had time even to eat.

III. His relations, therefore, who ⁱ also seem to have been living in Capernaum, consisting of his mother and his brethren—Joseph, in all probability, being long since dead—apprised of these circumstances, and afraid, as we may suppose, for his health, go forth

^g Mark iii. 19.

^h Mark iii. 20.

ⁱ John ii. 12. vii. 3.

for the purpose mentioned Mark iii. 21, and at a time which, as the preceding verse may very well imply, was the time of some repast; probably the morning's.

IV. Before their arrival, the demoniac, blind and dumb, is brought to our Lord, and healed^k; after which the blasphemy, on the part of the Pharisees; the discourse in answer to it; the demand of a sign from heaven; the refusal of that demand; the sequel of the refutation of the blasphemy; as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark, either wholly or in part: are all consecutively delivered^l.

V. At the end of the whole, our Lord's relations arrived; and their coming was made known to him, when upon finding the entrance of the house beset, they sent a message to him within^m. By refusing to attend to that message, the object of which was to interrupt the discharge of the functions of his ministry, our Lord not only reproved his relations for their improper, though perhaps well-meant, interference with his duties; but also by the pointed contrast between his disciples and them, intimated to the multitude that, in disregarding the claims of private duty, he was obeying the claims of public; he was only sacrificing an inferior to a superior obligation.

VI. After this, and probably not much later than the third hour of the day, the time which is known, in classical writers, by the ἀγορὰς πλεθώρα, he leaves the house where he was, and repairs to the lakeⁿ; where he delivers a series of parables, for the first time in the course of his ministry; himself, with his disciples, on shipboard, and the people standing on the land^o.

VII. Having made an end of those parables, but

^k Matt. xii. 22, 23.
46—50. Mark iii. 31—35.
iv. 1—34. Luke viii. 4—18.

^l Ch. xii. 24—45. iii. 22—30.

ⁿ Matt. xiii. 1.

^m Matt. xii.

^o Ch. xiii. 2—35. Mark

probably explained none of them as yet, not even to his own disciples; (concerning which more may be said, in its proper place, hereafter;) he returns to the house which he had lately quitted; and secludes himself there, with his disciples, for the rest of that day ^p. The multitude however still continued without, in the same numbers as before. The time of the return was probably the time of the usual noon-day's meal, or not much after it; and while our Lord and his disciples were still alone within, he explains, at their request, all or most of the preceding parables, and adds a few more, still in private.

VIII. During this explanation, perhaps when that of the sower was just completed, his relations make a second attempt to see him, the effect of their former failure; and, being again disappointed of admission, they transmit a second message to him, like the former; which is answered substantially, but not verbally, as before ^q.

IX. After sunset ^r in the evening of the same day, he leaves the house (where he must consequently have remained secluded since his return from the lake) a second time; and finding the multitudes still numerous about it, as the best expedient for dismissing them he gives commandment to cross the lake ^s.

X. On the way to the lake, accordingly, the incidents recorded Matt. viii. 19—22, must be supposed to happen. Arrived at the lake he embarks, and sets sail: and, by the help of what follows, it may be shewn that he neither returned the same night to Capernaum, nor landed at Gergesa until the morning; and consequently that he spent the night on the lake.

I. His motive, in going to the other side at all, was

^p Matt. xiii. 36—52. Mark iv. 34. ^q Luke viii. 19—21. ^r Mark iv. 35. ^s Matt. viii. 18. 23. Mark iv. 35, 36. Luke viii. 22.

to oblige the multitude to disperse; or at least to relieve himself from their importunity: and this effect was more likely to ensue if they thought he was gone away for the night, than if they expected to see him shortly come back.

II. The breadth of the lake, (though probably not uniform,) according to Josephus, was forty stades; and according to Pliny six Roman miles. It was after sunset, or in the evening, when they set out; and a storm was encountered by the way. If they were going in the direction of Gadara, that was not over against Capernaum, but considerably lower down to the south-east^t: and even if they were proceeding to Gergesa, still the passage would probably not take up less than an hour; and the storm which intervened would doubtless add to its length.

III. After the autumnal equinox, it would be dark within an hour from sunset, and much more within two or three.

IV. When Jesus returned to Capernaum, the multitude were found collected on the shore of the lake, and anxiously waiting to receive him^u. This might naturally be the case on the following morning; but it could scarcely happen the same night. Their anxiety too for the return of our Lord in this instance might be produced by the fact of the storm the preceding evening. They could not as yet know how Jesus and his disciples had fared in that storm; and they would be impatient to see them again on that account.

V. Before and during the storm, as all the evangelists agree, our Lord was asleep. No solution of this fact is so probable as that he was composed to rest for the night. The reluctance of the disciples to awaken

^t Jos. Vita, 9. 10. 65. p. 97.

^u Mark v. 21. Luke viii. 40.

him, until the danger was become imminent and pressing; the answer returned just before to the scribe^v, beautiful and pathetic as it was; are pertinent, also, and significant, if Jesus was gone to sleep for the night; or was preparing to pass the night in the open air upon the water.

VI. When he landed at the opposite side, the demoniac is said to have seen him a *great way* off^w. If so, it must have been broad daylight at the time; that is, the landing did not take place until the following morning.

VII. This demoniac, it is also said, was by *night* and by *day*^x among the tombs. If he met our Lord in the *morning*, just as he was landing from the ship; this circumstance would both explain the reason, and confirm the truth of that observation.

VIII. There was near the place a large herd of swine, feeding in their usual pasture at the time; which herd it is much more probable had been brought there that morning, than kept out there all night; or not yet driven home. If it was never customary to keep out such herds all night, they would be driven home by sunset at almost any period of the year; and after the feast of Tabernacles, whatever might be usual at other times, no description of cattle, and much less swine, would be found in the fields all night.

IX. The people of the city, as well as of the neighbouring country, were all up and stirring at the time; or they could not have been so instantly alarmed by the report of the keepers of the swine, and so soon brought out in a body, to see what had happened; and to request our Lord to depart from their coasts.

X. If he returned (as after this request he is said to

^v Matt. viii. 20.

^w Mark v. 6.

^x v. 5.

have returned) immediately ^y, and yet the same night that he had arrived; then he must have been entertained, at a most unusual hour for a supper, that same night; he must have been applied to by Jairus^z, and must have raised his daughter, at a still later hour, that same night; he must consequently have set out to his house either in the dark, or by torch-light; the miracle of the issue of blood, performed by the way ^a, must have been performed under corresponding circumstances: and yet nothing can be clearer than that every thing relating to this miracle was transacted in the open day ^b.

We may consider it therefore almost demonstratively certain, that Jesus neither came back from Gadara the same evening on which he set out, nor in all probability landed there until the next morning. Whatever occurred on the other side occurred consequently in the morning; and perhaps so early in the morning, as to allow of his returning to Capernaum in time for the usual morning's repast; or not much later than it^c. Certainly, at least, his return would not be too late for the hour of dinner; the fifth hour of the day with the ancients, eleven in the morning with us. His finding the people, on the shore, ready prepared for his reception; and his being at meat in the house of some disciple, when the application of Jairus was made to him; are both on this supposition naturally accounted for. The command, too, to give the daughter of Jairus, as soon as she had been restored to life, something to eat^d, might be intended as much to denote what would have been usual and in course at the time; and therefore to attest the completeness of the effect produced in the recovery of health and strength; as for physical

^y Matt. ix. 1. 10. ^z Matt. ix. 18. ^a Ib. 20—22. ^b Mark v. 30—34.
^c Matt. ix. 1. Mark v. 21. Luke viii. 40. ^d Mark v. 43. Luke viii. 55.

reasons of any kind, known to our Saviour, though concealed from us.

The next events to this, the cure of the two blind men, the dispossession of the dumb demoniac, and the repetition of the blasphemy^e, committed the day before, by some of the same persons in general, who had committed it then, were consecutive upon the last miracle; and like every thing else since the return from Gadara, were included in the compass of one and the same morning; which is the second morning since the point of time indicated at Mark iii. 19, or Matt. xii. 22. In consequence of the last event, in particular, it would seem that Jesus determined again to leave Capernaum, and the vicinity of the Pharisees; which he did first of all, by a visit to Nazareth^f; intending, as we may collect from the sequel, to commence in the next place another general circuit from thence, as he had lately commenced one from Nain.

This visit, the second instance of its kind, is placed by St. Mark after the raising of Jairus' daughter; as the subsequent circuit is by St. Matthew after the dispossession which followed in the course of the same day. By both consequently these incidents are placed in a similar order, and at the same point of time; or nearly so. Nazareth, like Nain, was not more than a day's journey distant from Capernaum; so that, if the preceding events happened all in the morning, it was possible to arrive there in the course of the same day; and certainly sometime in the next. How long that might be before the sabbath on which Jesus entered into the synagogue and taught, we cannot exactly determine. As however he would neither set out to Gadara, nor return from it, on a sabbath; a visit to Nazareth, even on the day after he returned to Caper-

^e Matt. ix. 27—31. Ib. 32—34.

^f Matt. xiii. 53—58. Mark vi. 1—6.

naum, that is, on the third day since he went to Gadara, could not be more than half a week, and probably was less than that, before the recurrence of a sabbath*. The mention of this visit is omitted by St. Luke, because he had already particularized the former.

That it was the prelude to a circuit, undertaken immediately after it, appears first, from Mark vi. 6; which affirms that Jesus began to go about the villages in a circle, teaching: and secondly, still more clearly from Matt. ix. 35; which shews that he began to go round *all* the cities and *all* the villages, teaching, and preaching, and performing miracles, as on every similar occasion before: a description, applicable to nothing but the fact of a general circuit; and that also the *third* of its kind since the commencement of our Lord's public ministry, and the second which had transpired in the course of the present year. Its relative position in the narrative of St. Matthew is clearly equivalent to the place which it occupies in St. Mark; and on this point there can be no difficulty. St. Luke may have omitted it, partly because he had specified another so recently before it; partly because St. Matthew and St. Mark had both recorded this, as they had both passed over the former. Yet he also, as well as they, relates the fact of the mission of the Twelve; a fact, which arose out of this circuit itself; as Matt. ix. 36—x. 1. is sufficient to prove.

The immediate motive to a second progress over all Galilee, so soon after the former, I cannot help ascribing to the recent transactions in Capernaum. The

* If it be true that the ordinary fast-days with the sect of the Pharisees (and, therefore, as we may presume, with the dis-

ciples of John) were Monday and Thursday; it would be on one of these days that Jesus returned from Gadara.

rooted malignity twice in succession displayed by the Pharisees, in imputing our Lord's miracles to Beelzebub, seems to have determined him to remove at once from their vicinity; in which case, he could not perhaps be otherwise employed, at this period of his ministry, than upon a general circuit. That between the close of the last such progress, and the expiration of the present year, there was room and opportunity for another like this, no one will deny; and did we not suppose something of that kind to have now intervened, that we could not fill up the hiatus in the continuity of events, or account satisfactorily for the disposal of the residue of the year, is equally indisputable. Its duration, I assume, as in former instances, to be about three or four months; whence, if it began in October it might be over in February; and, whatever time it occupied in particular, yet along with the mission and ministry of the Twelve, which arose out of it, that it must have taken up on the whole about six months will appear more clearly from the sequel.

Towards the middle, if not at the beginning of this circuit, for reasons which will be stated in the last volume of this work^g, I think it most probable that, after an imprisonment of about eighteen months, John the Baptist was put to death. The account of his death is related by St. Matthew and St. Mark^h; though in the way of an historical digression: whereas St. Lukeⁱ, while he makes Herod say, John have I beheaded; but who is this? and therefore plainly alludes to the fact of his death, yet enters into no explanation of the allusion. For this omission it would not be easy to account, except by supposing that he must have considered his readers already too well aware of the fact,

^g Vide the Appendix.

ⁱ Luke ix. 7—9.

^h Matt. xiv. 1—12. Mark vi. 14—29.

to render any such explanation necessary; and consequently that he also considered them to be previously acquainted with the Gospel of St. Matthew, or of St. Mark, which only could have made them aware of it. If so, he must have written after one or both of them; and must have seen either that one or both of them.

This circuit, like every other but the last, we may presume would terminate at Capernaum; where, like every other, also, it had originally begun: and therefore we may presume also that the mission of the Twelve, which took place at or towards its close, took place from Capernaum. It is certain that, after their mission, they rejoined our Lord at Capernaum; and it is not probable that they would be sent from one quarter, and be expected to rejoin him at another. The reference to some city^k in the course of the charge, where both Christ and they were present at the time, can be understood of none with so much propriety as of this. No city was so likely to be the place where our Lord would stop to commission, and dispatch from thence, his apostles upon a circuit by themselves, as Capernaum, their common residence and his. It strengthens the supposition of the place in question, that there is every reason to conclude the Seventy also were sent, upon a similar mission, from Capernaum. Besides, the Twelve, if they were ever called as disciples, were almost all so called *there*; and when they were ordained as apostles, were certainly all ordained there: with which facts it is but consistent that they should have proceeded on their first apostolic errand from thence. The reference also in μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν^l, compared with the different passages elsewhere in which we meet with a similar reference to specify some exact place, yet independent of any

^k Matt. x. 23.

^l Matt. xi. 1.

thing before or after^m; it will be concluded can be properly understood only of so well known a place as Capernaum.

The length of the time, for which the apostles were absent, must be determined by the interval between the probable close of our Saviour's circuit just before, and the precise period of their return. This period was certainly just before a Passover which fell out in the middle of April; and we have assumed that the Twelve were probably dispatched three or four months after a feast of Tabernacles which expired on the first of October. They might therefore be sent upon their ministry in February, and return to our Lord in March; the duration of their absence being one half, or one third of the length of our Lord's circuits in general. And, indeed, if three or four months was the ordinary duration of one of these, as performed by our Lord singly; one month or two months would be sufficient for the discharge of their's, begun, and going on while it lasted in six different companies, and in six different directions at once. The mission of the Seventy, in the ensuing year, is a case in point; and that mission, as it is probable, did not occupy even so much time as this.

We have no account of the proceedings of the apostles, subsequent to their departure, except that they did—what our Saviour had always done—*preach*, and *teach*, and work miracles of a certain description; and that, wherever they went, they were sustained by the attendant providence of their Masterⁿ. From the notice, however, which occurs at Matt. xi. 1, it may be safely collected that, while they were absent on the work of their commission, our Lord himself also was

^m Matt. xv. 21. Mark vii. 24. x. 1. 6. xxii. 35.

ⁿ Mark vi. 12. 13. Luke ix.

not inactive ; but similarly engaged in the cities and the synagogues, apart from them. We possess therefore in this intimation an evidence of the manner in which *his* time likewise was occupied, between the close of the last circuit, and the arrival of the next Passover ; viz. in a kind of circuit, similar to what he had undertaken at other times before, but necessarily on a more limited scale, and completed within a much shorter time. Of such partial circuits this was consequently the second instance, which had yet occurred ; and both this and the first were events of the same year. It was over however before that of the apostles ; for they found Jesus at Capernaum on their return ; and were taken by him, with little or no delay, as the motive assigned for the act is sufficient to prove, to the other side of the lake °.

On the local position of the quarter to which they were taken, something is said in the note below * ; at

* The site of the place to which our Lord proceeded with the apostles, on this occasion, is specified by St. Matthew and St. Mark as merely some *desert place*, and *apart* ; and by St. John, as somewhere on the *other side* of the lake ; and by St. Luke, as a desert place belonging to a city called Bethsaida.

A place of the name of Bethsaida was certainly situated at the northern extremity of the lake of Galilee, nearly over against Capernaum ; and consequently on the other side of the lake. As such, it is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xviii. ii. 1. Bell. ii. ix. 1. iii. x. 7. Vita, 72.) and placed at the point where the Jordan entered the lake, and

at a furlong's distance from the shore. It is commonly supposed that this was the city of Bethsaida, and this the wilderness in its vicinity, which our Lord visited on the present occasion. There are many reasons, however, which incline me rather to believe that it was a different place, though of the same name, situated much lower down, but on the same side of the lake—to the south.

First of all ; the name of the Bethsaida of Josephus, at this period of its history, was Julias. Philip the tetrarch, within whose dominions it was situated, either upon the confirmation of his father's will in his own behalf by Augustus, or upon the accession

present, I assume that it was in Decapolis: and, consequently that this is the first occasion, upon which

of Tiberius; (in either case, however, long before the present time in the Gospel ministry;) had enlarged it from the rank and dimensions of a *κώμη* or village, to those of a *πόλις* or city; and called it by the name of *Julias*, in honour of *Julia* the daughter of *Augustus*, or of *Julia* the mother of *Tiberius*: for this circumstance also is differently represented by *Josephus*. From that time forward, then, the name of *Bethsaida*, as we may presume, would be merged in that of *Julias*; just as its rank of a *κώμη*, or village, certainly was in that of a *πόλις*, or city. And though the common people, with that natural tenacity of old names and usages which every where distinguishes the lower orders, might retain among them the original name of the place; yet it is not probable that *St. Luke*, in particular, whose attention to precision, and exactness in all matters of fact, and especially in every thing relating to the geography of *Palestine*, is one of his characteristic peculiarities, would call it by any name but that which was its most proper one.

In the next place, the neighbourhood of so large and populous a city as *Julias*, was not likely to be selected by our Lord for those purposes of privacy and concealment, which he had in view in taking his disciples across the lake. In the third place, as *St. Mark* tells us (vi. 45) that the disciples, when they were sent away by *Jesus*, were commanded to go before him

to *Bethsaida* (of Galilee); and *St. John* (vi. 17), that they obeyed these orders by setting out to the other side, towards *Capernaum*; I think it is implied by these statements that *Capernaum* was further off, from the place where the miracle was performed, than *Bethsaida* of Galilee; in other words, that referred to the position of *Bethsaida* on the *Peræan* side of the lake, the course of the disciples by sea would bring them to *Bethsaida* in Galilee, before it would to *Capernaum*; though both might lie in the direction of their course in general. Now the very reverse of this would be the case, if they were sailing from *Julias*, at the north-eastern end of the lake. Referred to that position, *Capernaum* lay between it and *Bethsaida*; nor was it possible, in sailing thence, to be proceeding alike towards *Bethsaida* first, and towards *Capernaum* at last; but just the contrary; towards *Capernaum* first, and towards *Bethsaida* last.

In the fourth place—it is exceedingly improbable that setting out from *Julias* to sail to *Capernaum*, the ship, in which the disciples were, should have made 25 or 30 stades or furlongs of its way across, and yet apparently be as far from the opposite shore, or at least from the point of its destination, as at first; which yet *John* vi. 19, and the corresponding accounts of the other evangelists, shew to have been the case. Twenty-five or thirty stades is almost as much as we can allow for the entire

there is any proof that our Lord visited the dominions of Philip; and the second upon which he appears to have crossed the lake. The history of the transactions on the other side, and from that time forward to the re-

distance along the lake, which it would be requisite to sail, between Julias and Capernaum.

Lastly, St. John tells us (vi. 22, 23.) that the place where the miracle was performed was *near to Tiberias*; so near that small vessels, *πλοῖα*, were speedily brought thence the next day, to carry away the people whom the departure of Jesus and his disciples had left on that spot by themselves, the evening before. St. John, we may justly suppose, never would describe in such terms as these the locality of Tiberias, referred to that of Julias: which were as far from each other as any two places well could be, upon the lake. I think this argument is decisive, at least to the effect that the Bethsaida, where the first miracle of feeding took place, was much nearer to Tiberias, than the Bethsaida afterwards called Julias. The identity of names, in these two instances, is little or no objection; where there was so much resemblance in the denominations of places, throughout the different parts of the country, as can be shewn to have existed in Judæa.

The site, then, of this Bethsaida I consider to be upon the south-eastern angle of the lake; or in that vicinity. Referred to this position, every circumstance in the Gospel narrative admits of an easy explanation: why the disciples, it might be said, were going to Capernaum, or to Beth-

saida, indifferently—why they might have made only two or three miles of their way, yet be as far from land as ever; why they should first land at Bethsaida in Galilee, not at Capernaum; why the place which they had quitted should be said to be near to Tiberias: and the like.

The only question which remains to be still considered is this. If Jesus was sailing from Capernaum in this direction; could the people who observed his departure, and ran before to meet him on the other side, arrive on foot by the same time that he and his disciples came there by water? This was possible, on one supposition, viz. that Jesus and his disciples set out from Capernaum in the evening, and landed at Bethsaida in the morning; as he did, indeed, on the occasion of the visit to Gadara: and that the people, who ran before on foot, travelled all night. The distance, which they would have to travel, upon this supposition, whether along the western, or along the eastern side of the lake, setting out from Capernaum, would be nearly the same; and in neither case greater than the absolute length of the lake, from north to south, sixteen Roman miles, half a day's journey ἀνδρὶ εὐζώνῳ, as I have proved more at large elsewhere, and shall further prove by additional facts and illustrations hereafter.

turn^p, is one and the first of the two instances in general, when the four Gospels all coincide, and go along in the narration of facts with each other. The harmony of the whole as resulting from their united accounts—is as follows :

I. The season of the year in general is ascertained by John vi. 4, which states that the Passover was at hand ; and the circumstance, which also he specifies, that there was much grass in the place, is a proof that the spring was far advanced. The Passover fell this year, which answers to U. C. 782, A. D. 29, as late as it possibly could, viz. upon April 16 : and the year had consequently been intercalated. If we fix the time of the present transactions about the close of the Jewish month Veadar, or the beginning of the Jewish month Nisan, the end of our March, or the beginning of our April ; we shall perhaps not be far from the truth ^q.

II. It is distinctly affirmed by St. Mark ^r, that the multitude saw our Lord and his disciples setting out ; and concluding, as we may suppose, whither they were going, that they ran before in great numbers, to be ready to meet them on the opposite side. Though Capernaum was contiguous to the northern extremity of the lake, and Bethsaida to the southern ; and this might consequently require a great effort of speed, yet it was far from impossible to be effected—as it is proved in the note premised. Hence if both parties had set out from Capernaum at the same time in the evening, they might both meet at the other side of the lake again, in the morning ; and certainly before the middle of the day.

III. Consistently with this supposition, when Jesus arrived, ἐξελθών—which can be understood perhaps of nothing but his landing from the ship—both St. Mat-

^p Matt. xiv. 13—36. Mark vi. 32—56. Luke ix. 10—17. John vi. 1—21.
^q Vide vol. i. 407. Dissertation xii. ^r vi. 33.

threw and St. Mark affirm that he beheld the multitudes ; that is, he found many of them on the spot ; and by this unexpected spectacle, which implied the extraordinary exertion they had made to keep pace with the ship, and, consequently, their great zeal and eagerness to be about him, and to hear him ; that he was so touched as to be moved with an impulse of compassion ; and his original purpose of conveying himself from them, or of consulting the personal ease and convenience of his followers, was changed into the contrary one of ministering to the spiritual wants of the multitude. St. John, who says^t that he went up into the mountain, and sat down with his disciples, before he speaks of his seeing the multitudes, is not inconsistent with St. Mark or St. Matthew ; but merely supplies some particulars omitted by them. For in the first place, the attitude, in which he describes our Saviour, is the attitude of one who had either made an end of teaching ; (which is, perhaps, the more probable supposition ;) or was preparing to teach : in which case, John vi. 3, will take up and continue Mark vi. 34, as well as Matt. xiv. 14, or Luke ix. 11. Secondly, as to the resort of the people, which our Lord on lifting up his eyes is said to have beheld^u, there is no reason whatever why this resort should not be understood either of the multitude already collected, as following him up into the mountain, or of the accessions of numbers, which in addition to those already on the spot would be momentarily arriving from other parts.

IV. Though Jesus and the people had met at Bethsaida only by the third or fourth hour of the morning, the business of teaching the multitude, and performing miracles on such as needed them, might evidently be

^t Ch. vi. 3.

^u John vi. 5.

over by the ninth hour of the day : the period of ὀψία πρωτα, in opposition to sunset, the period of ὀψία δειλη. At this time the day might strictly be said to have begun *to decline* ; and Luke ix. 12 would be critically in unison with Matt. xiv. 15, Mark vi. 35 : the usual supper-hour too, or at least the season of the evening's repast, among the Jews, would not be far off.

V. The multitude, then, having been miraculously fed ; a business which, if we consider their numbers, might easily occupy the time from the ninth hour to sunset, at least ; Jesus dismisses his disciples at a period of the day which John vi. 16 describes accordingly ; with a charge to return to Bethsaida in Galilee ; the site of which was in the region of Gennesaret, between Capernaum, and the southern extremity of the lake. The time of their departure then would not be earlier than the second ὀψία, or δειλη ὀψία : as not merely St. John, but St. Matthew and St. Mark^v also, clearly imply that it was. Meanwhile our Lord himself withdrew to the mountain ; and either persuaded the assembled people to retire, or would be speedily concealed from their observation by the shades of night.

VI. When the disciples in the vessel had got about thirty stades^w, or three miles on their course, (the slowness of their progress in so many hours being critically accounted for by the opposition of the wind, the direction of which must have been north-west ;) Jesus appeared to them about the fourth watch of the night ; Peter descended to meet him on the sea ; and he was afterwards received into the ship. The fourth watch would begin at the ninth hour of the night ; that is, at three in the morning with us : and as our

^v Matt. xiv. 23. Mark vi. 47.

^w John vi. 19.

Lord was visible at a distance, before he came near enough to be recognized—but at first only indistinctly—perhaps the time of his appearance was just the dawn of day; that is at this period of the year, between four and five in the morning. For, as to the supposition that he might be visible by moonlight; in the first place, the weather being rough and boisterous, the moon would have been obscured by clouds. In the second, if the time of the month was what I have supposed, about a fortnight before the Passover, the end of Veadar, or the beginning of Nisan, there could be no moon at all; and the very turbulence of the weather argues that rather than the contrary.

VII. As the disciples, when they were originally dismissed, had been sent away to Bethsaida^x, not to Capernaum; and as, on taking Jesus into the ship, they were miraculously transported at once to the quarter where they wished to go^y; they would land before sunrise in the morning not at Capernaum, but somewhere in the district of Gennesaret; more to the south; as St. Mark and St. Matthew^z do both imply*.

VIII. Having landed then after day-break, our Lord would find the people of the country on the alert. By these he might soon be recognized; and upon his recognition, and during his subsequent progress through the highly populous region of Gennesaret, back to Capernaum; (a progress which could scarcely fail to pass through cities and villages, as well as the open country, by the way;) those things might ensue which are

* St. John's expression ἡρχομεν τὸ πέραν—εἰς Καπερναοὺμ, vi. 17, has been explained to mean, that they were merely proceeding in the direction of Capernaum,

when they first set out; that Capernaum was the quarter where they wished to arrive at last, though they might pass by any other place on the way.

^x Mark vi. 45.

^y John vi. 21.

^z Matt. xiv. 34. Mark vi. 53.

described accordingly^a. Nor does it follow from this supposition, that the time taken up by the progress, before it arrived at Capernaum, requires to be reckoned at more than one day. The note of time, then, in St. John's Gospel, τῇ ἐπαύριον^b, admits just as well of being understood of the day before the meeting in the synagogue at Capernaum, as of the day after the miracle of the feeding at Bethsaida. The day of this meeting, as it has been seen elsewhere^c, was probably the sabbath-day; and such a sabbath-day as coincided with the seventh of April: for the Thursday before was probably the day of the feeding, and both coincided with the fifth of April; our assumed date for the true day of the nativity of Christ. With the discourse, mysterious, figurative, and interesting as it is, which ensued in the synagogue on this meeting, the particulars of our Lord's second year are obviously to be brought to a close. And now, at the termination of this discourse, the first distinct allusion, anywhere on record, to the future treachery of Judas, is found to occur^d; and so exactly a year before its completion, that it is seen to have been now predicted on Saturday the seventh of April, as it will be found hereafter to have been consummated on Friday the fifth of April.

^a Matt. xiv. 35, 36. 408. Dissertation xii.

Mark vi. 54—56.

^b Ch. vi. 22.

^c Vol. i.

^d John vi. 70, 71.

DISSERTATION XXIII.

PART IV.

General prospective survey of our Lord's ministry in Galilee ; first six months of year the third.

AS the history of the preceding transactions shewed the Passover not to be far distant, so the account of the question, which follows next in order^a, shews it to be arrived and past; for the mention of Scribes and Pharisees, Mark vii. 1, from Jerusalem, is in my opinion an implicit testimony both that the feast was over, and that it had not been attended by our Lord. We cannot suppose therefore that the ensuing circumstances transpired earlier than some few days after the twenty-first of the Jewish Nisan, which answered in the third year of our Saviour's ministry to April 23; though they might transpire in a short time after it. That the place where they happened was Capernaum, at which also the account of St. John, when it closed, obviously left our Lord, seems scarcely to admit of a question: and these points being presumptively determined, I shall observe in reference to this Passover, that it was the only feast of its kind which Jesus did not personally attend in Jerusalem. I have already shewn, indeed, that he was under no absolute necessity of attending all the feasts in their order; of which we cannot have a better proof than the fact that, out of the four great solemnities which recurred in each of the years of his ministry, by far the greatest part were not attended by him. I have shewn also that, of those which he did attend, he attended none

^a Matt. xv. 1—20. Mark vii. 1—23.

so regularly as the Passover; and of the four Passovers in the course of his ministry that he attended every one but this: and, in addition to the prudential reason which might occasion his absence from this, there was perhaps another; viz. the peculiarity of the time when the Passover itself fell out. If the Passover was celebrated this year on the sixteenth of April, the year was intercalated, and the Passover fell almost as late as it possibly could. The fourteenth of Nisan coincided in this year with the Julian April 16, and the tenth of Nisan with the Julian April 12; neither of which days had any connection with our assumed date of the Nativity, the Julian April 5. This was not the case with the other years of our Lord's ministry, especially the first and the last. The times, on which those two days then fell out, are remarkable for that connection. It was not equally the case with the Passover in his second year, when the fourteenth of Nisan coincided with March 29, and the tenth with March 25: for the 25th of March, though not the day of our Saviour's birth, was yet the date of the vernal equinox; and the tenth of Nisan coincided with that. But to return from this digression.

As to the method of reconciling the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark, which certainly stand in some need of adjustment; it will be the subject of a Dissertation hereafter: and I shall observe at present only that, no where in his Gospel does the latter in particular write so plainly like an original and independent authority, and not as the mere copyist of the former; and that the probable reason why St. Luke omits all mention of the transaction in question here, is because something very similar to it occurred, and is related by him to have occurred hereafter ^b.

^b Ch. xi. 37. to the end.

The question now put, and its answer, were followed by our Saviour's departure from Capernaum into the parts of Tyre and Sidon^c; consequently beyond the precincts of either Galilee; and more immediately in the vicinity of the tetrarchy of Philip. This quarter though he might often have approached in the course of his circuits heretofore, there is no proof that he had ever visited, or resided in personally; and consequently he could be known there, perhaps, only by report. His motive in visiting it now, as we learn directly from St. Mark^d, was concealment; though such was his reputation, and such the attention paid to all his movements, that, as the same testimony acknowledges, he could not be hid. The final end of this concealment itself was, in my judgment, to escape the observation of his pertinacious enemies the Scribes and Pharisees; and I consider such a visit to such a quarter an argument that he left Capernaum soon after the last transaction; the effect of which, as St. Matthew informed us^e, was not to diminish, but to widen the breach between them, and to aggravate their ill-will towards himself. He might choose the parts of Tyre and Sidon, not merely on account of their remoteness from Judæa, though that was some days' journey in extent^f; but because it was a Gentile country, into which the Pharisees would scruple to follow him; or at least because of its proximity to the dominions of Philip, the only one among the sons of Herod who seems to have been a good and just prince^g; and more likely to afford shelter and protection, within his government, to an innocent person, persecuted by the most powerful and unprincipled of the Jewish sects; than the tetrarch of Galilee.

^c Matt. xv. 21. Mark vii. 24. ^d Ch. vii. 24. ^e Ch. xv. 12. ^f Jos. Contra Apionem, ii. 9. ^g Ant. Jud. xviii. iv. 6.

I do not consider it improbable that, like Elijah in the days of Ahab, our Lord bent his steps, on this occasion, in the direction of Zarephath or Sarepta; for that was midway between Tyre and Sidon, and, according to Jerome, situated on the high road ^h *. One thing is clear; viz. that the miracle, performed on the daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman, must have been performed almost as soon as he arrived in that vicinity, and directly after he had entered some houseⁱ; which circumstance enables us to harmonize the two accounts of it accordingly.

The comparison of the Evangelists renders it evident that St. Matthew, from verse 22 to 24 *inclusive*, begins with relating what took place in public; and from verse 25 to the end, proceeds to what took place in private; whereas St. Mark, from first to last, confines himself to the latter only. The woman first made her application to our Lord in public, and before he had entered into any house; for this is what is meant by her crying *unto him*, in Matt. xv. 22, and her crying *after them*, in verse 23. For even subsequent to this, she is said, at verse 25, to have come and worshipped him: which denotes that she fell down at his feet. That part of the transaction begins to be intimated by St. Mark, at verse 25, when Jesus was already in private; and consequently it is from this point of time that the two narratives coincide, and go along together. The harmony, which may thence be established, will be exhibited in its proper place hereafter.

* Achilles Tatius, De Clitophon-
tis et Leucippes Amoribus,
ii. 17: ἐπειδὴ ἐγένετο κατὰ Σάραπτα,

κώμην Τυρίων, ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ κειμένην.
So likewise cap. 18.

^h Ant. Jud. viii. xiii. 2. Hieronymus, Operum ii. 486. *ad principium*. De
Situ et Nominibus. ⁱ Matt. xv. 22—28. Mark vii. 25—30.

The notoriety of the miracle now performed, which had been conceded solely to the importunity of maternal tenderness, and to the more than usual display of the constancy and the strength of faith; could not but interfere with our Lord's desire of privacy: and seems in fact to have been the motive which determined him to leave the same parts again, before he had made any stay there. When he did this, both St. Matthew and St. Mark attest that he came to the sea of Galilee in general^k; and the latter, that he came thither through the coasts of Decapolis in particular. It is evident therefore, that he travelled first from the confines of Tyre and Sidon eastward, aloof from Galilee as before, until he crossed the Jordan in some part of its course between its springs and the northern extremity of the lake of Tiberias; and afterwards southward; through the dominions of Philip all the time, in which Decapolis also was included. And this likewise was a part which, though he might frequently have approached before, he had never visited, or resided in personally. Nor does it appear that he was visiting it now for the purpose of preaching in it, but for the sake of retirement. All this time he was confining himself to a distant quarter, where he would either be personally unknown, or at least very imperfectly known, except by fame; and he was intentionally keeping away from the regions which had been hitherto the scene of his ministry. And though wherever he went he might naturally be followed about by the people of the country in general, yet it would not be by those of that country in particular, before whom and among whom the two last years of his ministry had been almost exclusively transacted.

The part of Decapolis, to which he came, being

^k Matt. xv. 29. Mark vii. 31.

some quarter which bordered on the lake ; we may conclude from Matt. xv. 29. (which alludes to some well known mountain, such only as could be properly designated by the use of the article,) as well as from the course of subsequent events, that he came to the same desert of Bethsaida, and to the same individual mountain within that desert, where he had, not long before, fed the five thousand. How long after that miracle he thus revisited its vicinity, it may not be possible to say ; except that, if the account of his motions hitherto has been continuous, we may reasonably conjecture it was at no great distance of time.

Upon this mountain and in this region did Jesus remain, attended by the multitudes which had either accompanied him thither, or resorted to him since his arrival, or both, at least three days^l, which he employed in teaching the people, and in performing miracles ; a vast number whereof is mentioned summarily^m, but one only (which might have taken place on the first day of the three) is specified in detail ; a miracle performed upon a deaf and dumb personⁿ, the account of which is due, perhaps, more to the peculiar circumstances of the cure, and to the singular solemnity of our Lord's manner in working it, than to the novelty or remarkableness of the miracle itself.

On the third day, as it may be clearly collected from the testimony of each Evangelist ; and probably about the same hour of the day as before ; or at least at the usual time of some meal in the day ; the second instance of miraculous feeding took place^o. It took place, consequently, on the same locality as the former, and at no great distance of time after it ; and in the material fact it was altogether so similar to it, that

^l Matt. xv. 32. Mark viii. 2. ^m Matt. xv. 30, 31. ⁿ Mark vii. 32. to the end.
^o Matt. xv. 32—38. Mark viii. 1—9.

St. Luke, who had recorded the one, might very well omit the other*.

* It is observable that, in the account of this miracle, the two Evangelists agree in calling the baskets, by which the fragments were measured, *σπυρίδας*; and in the account of the former miracle, all four agreed in calling those, by which the fragments at that time also were measured, *κόφινους*. We may presume then that so regular a distinction between these two things was not unintended: and the same conclusion is implied in the terms of our Lord's joint reference to both the miracles, Matt. xvi. 9, 10, Mark viii. 19, 20, so soon after the second. What however was the real difference between the two kinds of basket, it would be hard to say. That the Jews were accustomed to carry *cophini* about with them, we may safely collect from Juvenal, Nunc sacri fontis nemus, et delubra, locantur | Judæis: quorum cophinus, fœnumque, suppellex. iii. 13. And again, Cum dedit ille locum: cophino fœnoque relicto, | Arcanam Judæa tremens mendicat in aurem. vi. 541. The Scholiast, on this last passage, says the *cophinus* was used by the Jews, Quod his pulmentaria sua, et calidam aquam die sabbati servare consuevunt: which is little better than absurd, or at least is far from describing the whole of the purposes for which it was intended. Yet the *cophinus* is enumerated by Pollux, Onomasticon iv. 23. as both a dry measure and a liquid, among the Bœotians at least. Elsewhere (x. cap. 29) he classes it with τὰ ἀγγεία

τὰ ὑποδεχόμενα τὴν ὀπώραν.

It may be inferred from the above passages, that the use of the *cophinus* was chiefly to serve its owner as a *couch*; and that of the *hay*, which seems to have gone along with it, as *bed* or *bedding*. May we infer, therefore, that the *κόφιννοι* and *σπυρίδες* were wanted by those, who attended our Saviour, to provide them with the means of sleeping, so long as they remained ἐν ἐρήμῳ, and in his company? That the *σπυρίς*, at least, was large enough to contain a man, may be collected from Acts ix. 25, in the account of St. Paul's escape from Damascus. But why were the people in the former instance all provided with *κόφιννοι*, and in the second, all provided with *σπυρίδες*? I should conjecture, because in the former instance the miracle was wrought about the feast of the Passover, and in the latter about the feast of Pentecost. Critics, at least, are agreed in deriving the name of the *σπυρίς* from *σπυρός*, triticum; and Hesychius explains it accordingly, τὸ τῶν σπυρῶν ἄγγος. It is needless to observe, that Pentecost was the season of *wheat*-harvest, as the Passover was of the *barley*-harvest: and hence, if there was any difference between the *κόφιννος* and the *σπυρίς*, or any appropriation of one of them to one season of the year, and of the other to another; the former might be wanted about the Passover, and the latter about Pentecost. The former might be proper for the rainy season; the latter for the dry. Now the miracle in the

It is manifest that, previously to the miracle, Jesus intended to dismiss the multitude; and his supplying them with food beforehand was only a benevolent precaution, that so they might be able to travel to their respective homes. Yet its effect, as in the former instance, would doubtless be to accelerate his own departure; lest, as St. John expressed himself then, they should come, after the experience of two such miracles; (the latter of which could not fail to recall to their minds the former;) and make him by force their king. The mention of the ship ^p, in which he accordingly embarked, and the consequent fact of his departure by sea, in which both the Evangelists are agreed, though both also suppose that he came to Bethsaida originally by land, is critically to be explained by the proximity of Bethsaida to Capernaum, on the one hand, and by the three days' previous stay there, on the other. It is nothing incredible that the ship had either been brought to him, or expressly been sent for, from Capernaum on one of those days. The article prefixed to the mention of it, ἀπλω̄ς—as τὸ πλοῖον—shews that it was some ship which was regularly employed on such occasions; and which, since the point of time specified Mark iii. 9, (where this circumstance was first expressly alluded to,) may be considered to have been always attending on his motions in the vicinity of the lake. Nor is it improbable that the ship which is designated in the places

first instance, as it has been	the miracle, in the second,
shewn elsewhere, took place not	might take place almost as short
long before the Passover; and	a time before the Pentecost ^o .

^o Propertius, iv. ii. 27. Arma tuli quondam, et memini laudabar in illis: | *Corbis* in imposito pondere messor eram: which, perhaps, implies that reapers were accustomed to carry a basket about with them. Cf. Ovid, *Metam.* xiv. 643, 644. Suidas has a quotation from an unknown author, voce Κάλλυντρα, which shews that under certain circumstances, a basket, κόφινος, might be carried about: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ δόρατος κάλλυντρον φέρων, καὶ κόσκινον ἀντὶ τῆς ἀσπίδος, καὶ κόφινον ἀντὶ κράνους, ἐπὶ ὄνου καθήμενος.
^p Matt. xv. 39. Mark viii. 10.

annexed^q, and called indifferently sometimes *πλοῖον*, sometimes *πλοιάριον*, in all those instances was one and the same, and the property of Simon Peter.

St. Matthew says that, upon leaving this quarter, Jesus came into the confines of Magdala; St. Mark, that he came into the parts of Dalmanutha. It follows therefore that Magdala and Dalmanutha were either different denominations for the same region, or separate denominations for distinct, but contiguous regions. And as our Lord before was at Bethsaida, on the eastern side of the lake, and as we shall see hereafter, in order to arrive at Magdala would have to cross *εἰς τὸ πέραν*, we may infer that each of these regions, whether in themselves the same or adjacent, were situated on the western side of the lake.

If this however was the case, they were somewhere in the vicinity of Capernaum; and probably not more than half a day's journey distant from it; for the sea of Tiberias, even on Pliny's calculation, as well as that of Josephus, was not sixteen of our miles long. The Pharisees, therefore, whom the first transaction in the course of this present year left at Capernaum, might soon hear of Jesus' arrival so immediately in their neighbourhood; and consequently might go forth on purpose (as the assertion of St. Matthew, xvi. 1, and of St. Mark, viii. 11, is most naturally understood to imply) from Capernaum to Magdala or Dalmanutha—to find him out, and to question with him there; as they had recently done in Capernaum.

The demand of a sign^r, which now ensued, is the second instance of the kind in the first three Gospels, at least upon record; and it is a proof of the *animus* with which they, who preferred it, were actuated on

^q Luke v. 3. Mark iii. 9. iv. 1. Matt. xv. 39. Mark viii. 10. John xxi. 3. 8.
^r Matt. xvi. 1—4. Mark viii. 11, 12.

this occasion as well as upon the former. The arrival of our Lord in these parts was consequently not much posterior to his last departure from Capernaum: and as each of the Evangelists tells us that, when he had answered the demand of the Pharisees, he immediately left them and sailed away again, it is evident that he made no stay here; and it becomes a presumptive inference that the true cause of so speedy a departure was, as before, the desire to remove himself from the vicinity or from the observation of so troublesome and malicious a sect: whose hostility against himself was now as confirmed and inveterate in principle, as their ingenuity and contrivance were active and indefatigable in effect. I shall pause therefore for the sake of a few observations upon the transaction itself.

In the history of this also, the account of St. Mark would not easily be reconciled with the account of St. Matthew, if both were supposed to be coincident, and to go along with each other, throughout. But if the former is supplementary to the latter, and as far as it differs from it, (which is in the account of our Lord's reply,) begins where that ends; there is an admirable congruity between them. Now the answer, which St. Matthew ascribes to Jesus, is altogether such as he might return, and as we may take it for granted, he did return, on the spot. The conduct and the language ascribed to him, on the other hand, by St. Mark, are altogether the conduct and the language of one, who was reflecting upon what had occurred; and making some observations respecting it to others, and not to the parties before addressed. For in the first place, he sighed, and sighed deeply, before he uttered any thing; as one might do, who was revolving in his mind some new proof of the obduracy of the people: and secondly, he expressed himself thus; Why does

this generation σημείον ἐπιζητεῖ? where there may be an emphasis in ἐπιζητεῖ, so as to signify *flagitat*; What makes this generation so repeatedly ask for a sign? for this was not the first instance of the kind. Lastly; Verily I say unto you, (or, as it is much stronger in the original;) εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημείον: the Hebrew idiom for conveying the most solemn asseverations; and tantamount to an oath. Yet he had told the inquirers just before, that the sign of the prophet Jonas should be given them; so that *some* sign was to be given. This last declaration in particular therefore could not be coincident with any part of Matthew xvi. 4. It was not likely to be addressed to the inquirers at all; nor does it appear, from St. Mark's account, that though accosted by them our Lord said any thing whatever to them. But it might be spoken to his own disciples; that is, it might pass in private, at the end of the former conference; and when the parties concerned in that had been dismissed. In this case, all is consistent with St. Matthew, and in the highest degree natural and probable in itself. But to proceed.

It is implied by each of the Evangelists^s that, when Jesus departed, he went away εἰς τὸ πέραν; and they each of them record by the way^t the discourse between our Lord and his disciples, respecting the figurative caution to beware of the *leaven* of the three principal sects: a caution which, from the accidental circumstance of their having forgotten to lay in, before their departure, any supply of bread; (implying that, in their journeyings to and fro, they were accustomed to carry with them their own provision, and also that their departure from Magdala had been precipitate

^s Matt. xvi. 5. Mark viii. 13.

^t Matt. xvi. 5—12. Mark viii.

and sudden;) and because they were aware that the mutual animosity of the Jewish sects made them avoid, as much as possible, all dealings even of buying and selling with those of an opposite αἵρεσις or party: the apostles interpreted literally. The question then as to the site of Magdala and Dalmanutha, depends on the construction of the terms εἰς τὸ πέραν; that is, on the direction in which Jesus and his apostles were sailing.

Now St. Mark makes them land at Bethsaida^u, and relates the performance of a miracle on a blind man there^v. There was certainly a Bethsaida in Galilee^w; which Jerome also alludes to as situated on the lake of Tiberias. If Jesus was sailing towards that Bethsaida, he was sailing from east to west; and Magdala and Dalmanutha lay on the Peræan side of the lake. There was also another Bethsaida in Decapolis; the proper name of which, however, at this time, was Julius; as we shewed above. If our Lord was sailing towards that Bethsaida, he was sailing from west to east; and Magdala and Dalmanutha were situated accordingly. And there was, as we have seen, a third Bethsaida, situated somewhere in Decapolis, or in the contiguous region of Peræa, the scene of the first miracle of feeding, and very probably also of the second. The site of this was on the south-eastern side of the lake. I consider it most probable that St. Mark means this Bethsaida in the present instance: nor is it any objection, that he calls it here a village, but St. Luke (ix. 10.) called it a city; if it belonged to the number of what St. Mark elsewhere denominated κωμοπόλεις—places between *towns* and *cities*, which might be called either one or the other, indifferently. On this suppo-

^u Ch. viii. 22.

^v Ib. 22—26.

^w John i. 45. xii. 21. Mark vi. 45.

Matt. xi. 21. Luke x. 13.

sition, our Lord was sailing *to* the eastern side of the lake, and consequently *from* the western.

In any case, it becomes an argument that he was on the eastern side of the lake when he performed the miracle at Bethsaida; because directly after, he is said to go forth at once into the towns of Cæsarea Philippi ^x, that is, into the dominions of Philip. It is reasonable to suppose that he was on the verge of those dominions previously: which he would be at Bethsaida in Decapolis. Besides which, Bethsaida of Galilee was too near to Capernaum to have suited his purpose of concealment. Lastly, Mary ἡ Μαγδαληνή, that is, Mary of Magdala, was doubtless a Galilæan; and therefore her native place was situated in Galilee. Had it been on the eastern side of the lake, she would have been a native of Peræa.

The miracle performed at Bethsaida is one of the most singular, and in a certain point of view one of the most instructive, on record. It is one of the most singular, because it was performed at twice; and yet was not imperfectly performed on either occasion: it was perfect in each instance with regard to the effect so far produced, but the ultimate effect was more complete than the primary. It is the most instructive, because it contributes to illustrate, and even demonstrably supplies the evidence of a natural and necessary effect of some of the most remarkable of our Saviour's miracles; which notwithstanding, though as real as any, and perhaps the most wonderful of all, is the most recondite, and the least likely to appear externally.

The possession of a natural faculty of any kind, and the power of using that faculty according to its natural

^x Matt. xvi. 13. Mark viii. 27.

purposes, are very different things; especially in the case of those who, having been born destitute of the former, should be suddenly endued therewith. Every physiologist is aware that, under such circumstances, the free use of the faculty would be by no means an immediate and necessary consequence. The possession of the faculty, and even the power of using it, might both be communicated at once; but if no more were communicated at the same time, the complete, natural use of the faculty could be acquired only by degrees, requiring space and time; and the party restored to its possession, if left to himself, would be as helpless and destitute for some while longer, as if he had continued in his original state.

In every instance of our Saviour's miracles, and indeed of the miracles of the apostles generally, this free and immediate use of the faculty communicated is perceived to be as much an effect of the miracle, as the simple capacity of the use. The miracle, therefore, in all such cases, must have been attended by a double effect; the communication of a certain power or faculty, not before possessed, or not before capable of being exerted, and the ability to exert it freely on the spot. Whatsoever then was previously indispensable to such an exertion must have been communicated also; in other words, the subject of the miracle, with regard to the use and enjoyment of a certain sense or faculty, must have been placed at once in the same state as if he had never wanted it, or had never been unable to exert it.

On this principle, one who had been born dumb, and was afterwards endued with the faculty of speech, if he was enabled at once to converse, besides the power of utterance, must have had the knowledge of articu-

late sounds—in other words, the gift of a language, as such—bestowed over and above upon him : the communication of the faculty of hearing must have been accompanied by the communication of all the ideas, of which the sense of hearing is the medium : the gift of the faculty of sight by the gift of all, which are essential to the use and effect of sight : and so, in every other case likewise.

These auxiliary or concomitant effects of such miracles may justly be considered not the least extraordinary or admirable of all ; and the use of the miracle, now performed at Bethsaida, as it appears to me, is this ; that, with regard to the evidence of such effects, it is a case in point : and what seems to have held good in the secret process of this miracle, we may reasonably conclude, would be equally true under the same circumstances, of that of every other. The faculty of sight, and the power of using that faculty, were both communicated in this instance, and both communicated at twice ; and as far as the one was communicated, so far it was immediately attended by the other. As the faculty was communicated gradually, so the power was developed gradually ; but the use of the faculty still kept pace with the power of using it. The ideas of vision clearly went along with the exercise of the powers of vision ; and if the ideas were not all at once distinct, it was because the faculty was not all at once complete, or the power of its use all at once developed. But the man could comprehend what he saw, and could discriminate between what he saw, as far as he could see it, even from the first. The use then of the faculty of sight was still in proportion to the extent of the possession, or the degree of the power of its use ; and considered in reference to that, it was as ade-

quately exercised at first, when objects were seen confusedly, as at last, when every thing was perceived distinctly.

But to return from this digression. While Jesus was yet on the way to Cæsarea Philippi and its vicinity, according to St. Mark^a; and while he was praying by the way apart, with his disciples, according to St. Luke^b; the memorable confession of Peter, and directly after it, the first instance—and by St. Matthew and St. Mark, critically specified as such—of any particular prediction concerning the rejection, the death, and the resurrection of the Christ; (which, consequently, began to be thus foretold about a year before the event;) must have taken place^c. This prediction, like every other instance of its kind subsequently, as well as the rebuke of Peter^d which arose out of it, and the original question, which produced the confession, must have occurred, apart from the multitude, in the presence of the Twelve alone. But the doctrine of self-denial, and of the duty of taking up the cross, which followed upon the offence, and the rebuke of the offence of Peter; because it concerned all, was delivered in the audience of all^e. Our Lord is said to have expressly called the people to him, before he proceeded to discourse upon that subject.

The next event on record is the Transfiguration^f; which seems to have been, at least in their primary sense, the fulfilment of the concluding words in the above discourse, as they are reported by each of the evangelists. And so Theophylact understood it: οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερον ἢ μεταμόρφωσις ἦν, ἀλλ' ἡ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας προμήνυμα ε. The interval of time between this transaction and the last

^a Ch. viii. 27. ^b Ch. ix. 18. ^c Matt. xvi. 13—21. Mark viii. 27—31. Luke ix. 18—22. ^d Matt. xvi. 22, 23. Mark viii. 32, 33. ^e Matt. xvi. 24. to the end. Mark viii. 34—ix. 1. Luke ix. 23—27. ^f Matt. xvii. 1—9. Mark ix. 2—8. Luke ix. 28—36. ^g Operum i. 214. D. In Marc. viii.

is differently represented. By St. Matthew and St. Mark, it is placed six days afterwards; by St. Luke, about eight. The expression of the latter, however, ὥστε ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, is so guarded, that it must be evident he did not intend to affirm the interval of eight entire days; but either of seven whole days, and part of an eighth; or of six whole days, and parts of two more days. And as to the expression of St. Matthew and St. Mark, μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ; I shall shew hereafter that this may, and perhaps must be understood of six whole days, and a part of a seventh; in which case there will be no difference between the two statements, except of one day: and this may be explained as follows^h.

Luke ix. 37, our Lord and the three apostles are said to have come down from the mountain, τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ; which seems to me to imply very plainly that the Transfiguration took place the night before. And this conclusion is further confirmed by the circumstances before and during the event itself; that Jesus went up into the mountain for the purpose of private prayer, in order to which he is not seen to have retired apart at other times, except in the night, or early in the morning; that the apostles were *sleeping* at the commencement of the Transfiguration, and were awakened on purpose to behold it; that the whole transaction, awful and mysterious as it was, would be rendered still more solemn and impressive, if it happened amidst the darkness and stillness of the night.

On all these accounts, I think, we may infer that our Saviour took the three apostles up into the mountain either at the close of the preceding day, or what is equally probable, sometime in the ensuing night; that the Transfiguration occurred soon after, and there-

^h Cf. Epiphanius, i. 805. A—C. Ariani, lxxvii. Theophylact, i. 88. A—B. In Matt. xvii: 214. E. In Marc. ix: 335. C. D. in Luc. ix.

fore in the night ; that when this was over, they did not come down until the following day. Now in this case, from the day of the confession of Peter, reckoned as the first, to the day before the Transfiguration, reckoned as the last, the interval might be exactly *seven* days and six nights ; but from the same time to either the night of the Transfiguration, considered as part of the same Jewish *νυχθήμερον*, or to the morning of the day after it, the interval might be *eight* days and seven nights, or what St. Luke would call *ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ*. If St. Matthew and St. Mark go by the former rule, and St. Luke goes by the latter, it is manifest that their statements may both be correct ; and would both be consistent the one with the other. It is a probable conjecture, though I have not the means of rendering it demonstratively certain, that both the prediction of the Transfiguration, and the Transfiguration took place on the same day of the week ; either the Jewish sabbath, or the Christian Sunday. If either of these things was the case, then each mode of speaking concerning the distance of time between them would be strictly true. Let me assume that Christ was transfigured this year, at the same distance of time from the day of Pentecost, at which he ascended into heaven in the next. The day of Pentecost this year fell upon June 6, and the day analogous to Ascension-day before that was May 27. A. D. 29, May 27, according to the Tables was Friday, but, according to my computation, was Sunday. Moreover, the day of Pentecost itself the next year fell upon May 26, and May 26 on the first day of the week.

The scene of the Transfiguration is described by the Evangelists simply as an high mountain ; the other particular, *κατ' ἰδίαν*, which might be understood to belong to the same description, being rather to be understood of the taking the apostles apart. Yet I can discover

no good reason for questioning the ancient ecclesiastical tradition, which supposes it to have been mount Tabor; called by the Seventy and by Josephus, τὸ Ἰταβύριον ὄρος^h, situated in Lower Galilee, between the great plain of Galilee, and Scythopolis, the ancient Bethshan; on what were formerly the confines of the tribes of Issachar and Naphtali; accessible only on its northern side, rising to an altitude of thirty stades, and consisting, at its summit, of a level and grassy surface, the circumference of which was almost four Roman miles. Jerome also describes it asⁱ *Mira rotunditate sublimis, distans a Diocæsarea (the Sepphoris of Josephus) decem millibus, contra orientalem plagam* *. Nor is it any great objection that Jesus was previously in the vicinity of Cæsarea Philippi; for a week's interval would be more than sufficient in order to travel thence to mount Tabor. And that the Transfiguration happened somewhere in Galilee may be presumptively conjectured from the mention of Galilee, Matt. xvii. 22, Mark ix. 30—so soon afterwards. Nor is it improbable that either this mountain, or the mountain of Beatitudes near to Capernaum, was the very mountain on which our Lord was manifested in Galilee^k, after his resurrection; especially if, according to Adamnanus^l, its distance from the lake of Gennesaret is to be computed at merely three miles.

* Cf. likewise Hieronymus, iii. 1265. *ad med.* in Osee v: *Est autem Thabor mons in Galilæa, situs in campestribus, rotundus atque sublimis, et ex omni parte finitur æqualiter.* Cf. Origen, *Operum* ii. 775. B. *Selecta* in

Ps. 88. Le Bruyn, according to Mr. Harmer, describes mount Tabor as very high and steep. He was half an hour in climbing up it: Harmer, iii. 94, 95. chap. iii. Obs. xxx.

^h Ant. v. v. 3. xiv. vi. 3. Bell. iv. i. 8. Vita, 37. It seems to be so called, too, in the preamble to the Apocryphal Apocalypse, supposed there to take place, (*Auctarium Codicis Apocryphi*, 245.) ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τῷ Ταβὸρ (ita legitur), that is, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Ἰταβύριον.

ⁱ *Operum* ii. 490. *ad princip.* De Situ et Nominibus.

^k Matt. xxviii. 16.

^l Reland, *Palæstina*, i. cap. li. 333. 334.

With regard, however, to the further question of the time of this event, the history of our Saviour's motions hitherto has been so continuous, and the proof that, since he quitted Capernaum ^m, he stayed little or no time, in any particular place, is so clear and decisive; that I am persuaded whatsoever has been recorded, from that time to this, might all be comprehended in the first few weeks after the third Passover. The Transfiguration, both in itself as regarded the material fact, and in its secret meaning as referred to what was probably its moral end and purpose, must be considered on every account one of the most memorable transactions in our Saviour's lifetime on earth; which not only have the first three Evangelists recorded, accordingly, with proportionate distinctness, and the fourth ⁿ, if I mistake not, in no obscure terms alluded to*; but to arrive at which, as it appears to me, was the specific object of this part of their accounts from the first. The minuteness with which they relate the particulars of the intermediate events, from the beginning of the year, down to the time of this single transaction; compared with the brevity of their narratives for many months afterwards: is implicitly an argument that they were desirous to arrive regularly at this: but having done so, had nothing of equal interest or importance to dwell upon, for some time after. I place it therefore between the third feast of the Passover, and the third feast of Pentecost; concerning both which we have the clearest proof that our Lord attended neither of them in Jerusalem. The circumstances of the narra-

* Ποῦ δὲ ἐθεάσαντο τὴν δόξαν; τὴν δόξαν ἐν τῷ Θαβώρ: i. 148. E. ἵσως μὲν τινες ὑπολήφονται ὅτι ἐν in Matt. xxvi. Cf. 251. B. In τῷ ὄρει τῷ Θαβώρ: Theophylact, i. Marc. xiv: 335. A. in Lucam, ix. 517. D. in Johannem, i. Οἱς ἐδειξε

^m Matt. xv. 21. Mark vii. 24.

ⁿ John i. 14.

tive, directly afterwards, shew that the feast of Pentecost was either still to come, or already past; the former of which suppositions is just as probable as the latter. It might happen, therefore, ten days before it, on the day which we have conjectured, May 27.

The first event of the ensuing day was the conversation, between our Lord and the three apostles, as they came down from the mountain, respecting the traditional doctrine that Elijah should personally reappear before the advent of the expected Christ^o; a topic evidently suggested by the presence of Elijah along with Moses, in the recent colloquy which they had witnessed. The next, and directly after, was the cure of the demoniac^p; which the rest of the apostles, that is, the NINE who had not been with our Lord on the mountain, were unable to effect; though this might be the only instance of any such failure, since the original communication of miraculous power, adequate to effects like these; and a failure even in this instance perhaps to be ascribed to the absence either of our Lord himself, or of their companions; and to the diffidence or want of faith which might thereby be occasioned in the rest*.

* Or what is equally possible, it is simply to be ascribed to the nature of the cure itself, and to the peculiar obstinacy of the spirit with whom these apostles had to contend. For there is no reason why evil spirits, though they durst not but yield obedience to the commands of Christ himself, might not refuse submission, especially in his absence, to the commands of men; though empowered and assisted by him. I say this is at least a

conceivable case; for it is just as possible that wicked spirits, under certain circumstances, should refuse obedience to the will of God; as that wicked men should. It excited the surprise of the Seventy that *even the spirits were subject to them*; though they acted by an undoubted Divine commission, in their ejection: and the reluctance with which the demon, in the present instance, submitted even to the commands of

^o Matt. xvii. 10—13. Mark ix. 9—13. Luke ix. 37.
14—18. Mark ix. 14—27. Luke ix. 37—42.

^p Matt. xvii.

The allusion to the mountain^q, as close at hand; and also the critical circumstance that the multitude, when they saw our Lord, were amazed and astonished^r, and running up to him began to salute him; a very lively description of the effect produced by his appearance, and implying either that it was sudden and instantaneous, or that there was something in his person and aspect more than usually divine and resplendent; (the still visible emanation of that heavenly glory and transcendent majesty with which they had lately been illuminated*;) or both: are proofs of direct continuity in the order of all these events. After the miracle, as we may collect from Matt. xvii. 19–21, compared with Mark ix. 28. 29, our Lord must have retired to some private house; where the nine Apostles, apart from the people, inquired of him why they had been unable to perform this miracle, having probably performed others like it before. The answer shews that there was something peculiar in this case;

our Lord himself, by evacuating the body of which he had taken possession, appears from the violence of his effects on the subject, just before the dispossession and at the time of it. It is needless to observe that this miracle, and that upon the demoniacs at Gadara, are the most singular and striking of their kind; and it is probable that they were both left on record expressly to shew that the fiercest or most refractory of evil spirits were alike subject to the control, and however little inclined to acknowledge any other superiors, alike implicitly

submissive to the will of Christ. Our Lord's final address to this spirit, as reported by St. Mark, is such as we never find ascribed to him elsewhere; and such as might be purposely intended to mark the contrast between himself and his disciples. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφόν, ἘΓΩ σοι ἐπιτάσσω· Ἐξέλθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μηκέτι εἰσεέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν.

* Theophylact, Operum i. 217. C. In Marc. ix: τινὲς δὲ φασιν ὅτι καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ, ὡραιότερα γενομένη ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς τῆς μεταμορφώσεως, ἐφείλκετο τοὺς ὄχλους πρὸς τὸ ἀσπάσθαι.

^q Matt. xvii. 20.

^r Mark ix. 15.

such as Origen^s observes to have happened, under the same circumstances, in his own time: *δυσίατόν ἐστι τὸ νόσημα τοῦτο, ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας χάριν θεραπεύειν δαιμονῶντας, ὅτε μὲν ἀπαυδᾷν πρὸς τοῦτο, ὅτε δὲ, μετὰ νηστειῶν καὶ προσευχῶν, καὶ πλειόνων καμάτων, ἐπιτυγχάνειν.* The criterion therefore of these obstinate cases of possession was the exhibition of those symptoms externally, which might be produced naturally by epilepsy, but in these instances were due to demoniacal agency. In answer then to this inquiry, the similitude of the grain of mustard seed for the efficacy of the miracle-working faith, though for the first time, might very pertinently be found on record.

Posterior to these transactions we meet with no more particular details; yet I think that there is enough to imply a continued residence in Galilee, before the return to Capernaum preparatory to the next feast of Tabernacles: first, because John vii. 1, it is said, After these things (that is, the events in the synagogue of Capernaum) Jesus *walked* in Galilee; for he would not *walk* in Judæa. St. John, then, was aware that a considerable portion of our Saviour's time, during the first six months of this year, was passed in Galilee; and consequently was so from this time forward to the feast of Tabernacles: for hitherto there is no proof that he had *walked* (that is, lived and resided) in that country at all; unless his visiting the regions of Tyre and Sidon; his journeying to and fro in the dominions of Philip; his crossing or recrossing the lake, without landing or continuing any length of time upon the Galilæan coast; are to be considered such.

Secondly, because, Matt. xvii. 22, for some time at

^s Operum iii. 578. C. D. Comm. in Matt. tom. xiii. 6.

least *after* the preceding events, but *before* the return to Capernaum, xvii. 24, they were *conversant*, that is, living and residing in Galilee: and, Mark ix. 30, when they departed from the vicinity of Tabor, it was to *journey along* through Galilee. The same passage shews that, all this time Jesus was still desirous of privacy—οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνῶ: and as it is implied in each of the accounts, the only memorable particular which transpired throughout it, (and that, apparently, at the *beginning*, rather than the *end* of the progress,) was the repetition^t of the same particular prediction, concerning his death and resurrection, which had been once delivered before. If then the detail is resumed, it is so only with the account of the last part of the journey, at the time of the return to Capernaum^u: the particulars of all which, down to Matt. xviii. 35. Mark ix. 50, and Luke ix. 46–50, I shall have occasion to consider elsewhere. Nor shall I observe, for the present, on any part of it, except what relates to the demand of the tribute; that is, to the incident recorded Matt. xvii. 24. to the end: for this incident also, rightly estimated, will be found to support the same conclusion, that our Lord had been absent from Capernaum ever since the last Passover, and returned to it a little before the ensuing feast of Tabernacles.

That Judæa, from U. C. 691, B. C. 63, and thenceforward down to U. C. 819, A. D. 66, became and continued tributary to the Roman government, seems to be clearly implied by the passages quoted in the margin^v: and that the tribute was paid in the shape of a poll-tax is not incredible. That it was not however

^t Matt. xvii. 22, 23. Mark ix. 31, 32. Luke ix. 43–45. ^u Matt. xvii. 24. Mark ix. 33. ^v Ant. Jud. xiv. iv. 4, 5. Ib. vii. 1. Bell. i. vii. 6. Ib. viii. 8. Ant. xiv. xi. 2. Bell. i. xi. 2. Tacitus, Ann. ii. 42. Matt. xxii. 15–22. Philo, ii. 575. l. 13–23. De Virtutibus. Ant. Jud. xviii. vi. 3. Bell. ii. xvi. 4. 482.

the tribute intended in the present instance, appears from the drift of the reasoning addressed to Peter. Our Lord argues that the acknowledged exemption of the children, or the near relations of kings, from all such tributes or services as they impose upon strangers, would be a just ground of exception, in his own particular instance, from the demand in question. This argument supposes, then, that he himself stood in the relation of son to him, for the benefit of whose service the tax was understood to be levied; a supposition which would manifestly be true, if the tax was levied for the service of the temple, and our Saviour himself stood in the relation of Son to the God of Israel. And as proceeding upon the assumption of such a relation, we may observe by the way that the reasoning itself is a strong and convincing testimony to the proper sonship, and in the capacity of son to the proper relationship of Jesus Christ to the Father; which those who deny that relation will not easily evade or impugn.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that the tribute in question was the tribute required from every male Israelite, above the age of twenty, once in the year; and to be paid into the corban or treasury of God, for the current expenses of the temple-service^w. The original appointment of the tribute is thus recorded by Josephus: *τό τε πλῆθος ἀθροίσας πάλιν εἰσφορὰν αὐτὸ προσέταξεν εἰσφέρειν, σίκλου τὸ ἡμισυ καθ' ἕκαστον. ὁ δὲ σίκλος, νόμισμα Ἑβραίων ὦν, Ἀττικὰς δέχεται δραχμὰς τέσσαρας^x*. Hieronymus—in Ezechielem^y: Siclus, autem, id est stater, habet drachmas quattuor.

The continuance of the same tribute ever after; its recognition by the Jews of the Dispersion as well as of

^w Exod. xxx. 12—16. 2 Kings xii. 4. 2 Chron. xxiv. 6. 9. 10. Nehem. x. 32.

^x Ant. iii. viii. 2.

^y Operum iii. 722. *ad calcem*.

the mother-country; the peculiar denomination of τὸ δίδραχμον, or τὰ δίδραχμα by which it was known; its collection into banks or exchequers in every city, especially among Gentile communities, in order to be taken up at proper times, and by proper persons to Jerusalem: are facts abundantly confirmed by Philo, Josephus, and others * z. Τὸ δίδραχμον τῷ Θεῷ καταβάλλειν, ὃ ἐκάστοις πάτριον. The same tax, so paid before to the sacred treasury, the Jews were commanded by Vespasian to contribute for a time to the rebuilding of the Capitol at Rome; and the imposition was in being when Pliny was writing, where he speaks of the balsam-tree: Servit nunc hæc, et tributa pendit cum sua gente ^a. It continued in fact, most probably, to the end of the reign of Domitian.

It is asserted indeed by the rabbinical writers, that the tax for the temple was ordinarily due, and ordinarily to be collected about the Passover ^b; but it is much more probable, *a priori*, that it was really due, and really required to be paid at a time to which the payment of every other legal tribute, whether in money or in kind, appears to have been appropriated; that of the feast of Tabernacles. In this case the collectors of it at

* Philo Judæus, ii. 224. 25: De Monarchia, lib. ii: προσόδοις δ' ἔχει τὸ ἱερὸν οὐ μόνον ἀποτομὰς γῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺν μείζονος ἑτέρας, αἱ οὐδενὶ χρόνῳ φθαρῆσονται προστέτακται γὰρ ἔκαστον ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἀπαρχὴν εἰσφέρειν, ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετίας ἀρξαμένους . . . πολυανθρωποτάτου δ' ἔθνους, ὥς εἰκόσ, καὶ τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀφθονωτάτας εἶναι συμβέβηκε. σχεδὸν γοῦν ἀνὰ

πᾶσαν πόλιν ταμείον τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων ἔστιν, εἰς ᾧ παραγενομένοις ἔθος ἀπάρχεσθαι, καὶ χρόνοις ὀρισμένοις ἱεροπομποὶ τῶν χρημάτων εἰσὶν, ἀριστίνδην ἐπικριθέντες. ἕξ ἐκάστης δ' οἱ δοκιμώτατοι χειροτονοῦνται, σφύρας τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐκάστων παρεκπέμψοντες· ἐν γὰρ ταῖς νομίμοις ἀπαρχαῖς αἱ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἐλπίδες εἰσὶ.

z Ant. Jud. xviii. iii. 5. ix. 1. Vide also xiv. vii. 2. x. 8. xvi. ii. 3—5. vi. 2—7. Bell. v. v. i. vi. vi. 2. Philo ii. 568. l. 36—38; De Virtutibus: 578. l. 9—14: 588. l. 30, 31: 591. l. 43—592. l. 19: i. 499. l. 10, 11. Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres. Cicero, Oratio Pro Flacco, 28. ^a Jos. Bell. Jud. vii. vi. 6. Dio, lxvi. 7. Pliny, H. N. xii. 54. ^b Mishna, ii. 176. i. &c.

Capernaum, by demanding it now, were making provision for an approaching feast of that description; and therefore the return of our Lord to Capernaum, after which they immediately demanded it, could not have been long before the same time.

I do not know that the authority of the rabbis is of much weight with regard to any of the customs in our Saviour's day; but even upon their own shewing, the tribute of the half-shekel might be, and was in fact paid at each of the three great feasts^c. Ter in anno curant de conclavi; in spatio semestri (fifteen days) ante Pascha; in spatio semestri ante Pentecosten; et in spatio semestri ante Scenopegiam^d: upon which the Commentary of Maimonides is to the following effect: Tempore festi Paschatis publicabatur adducendam oblationem primam de loco propinquiori; et illi, qui remotiores erant, adducerent tempore festi Pentecostis; et illi, qui remotissimi erant, adducerent tempore festi Tabernaculorum. So also Bartenoras. It is plain too from 197. §. 5, that all this tax was never received in the year when it became due; and some of the thirteen chests, into which it was appointed to be received, were expressly reserved for arrears, under the name of *sicli veteres*.

The course of events, from this period forward, is to be computed from John vii. 2, and will be found to be regularly carried onwards by him as far as xi. 54: where, in like manner, it will be perceived to be taken up by Luke ix. 51: by whom also it will be carried forward to xviii. 15; where his account will be finally rejoined by Matt. xix. 13, and Mark x. xiii: and after an interval of almost six months, all will proceed in conjunction (St. John likewise from xi. 55,

^c Exod. xxiii. 15. 17. xxxiv. 23. Deut. xvi. 16, 17.

^d Mishna, ii. 184. 3.

in its proper place) to the close of the Gospel history. The proof of these positions is evidently necessary to the completion of our present undertaking; but as it would anticipate what will come more conveniently hereafter, I cannot now enter upon it. I shall conclude therefore this review of our Saviour's ministry, so far as it has yet proceeded, with a general summary of its results.

We have brought down the history of the ministry in Galilee, through a period of nearly two years and six months—to the arrival of the third feast of Tabernacles; and the whole of this period we have seen to be so fully occupied, that we may conclude we possess, in its history, a continuous outline, if not a particular detail, of the course and succession of events. During the first year there was no proof of any chasm in this continuity, except for the interval between the first feast of Tabernacles and the second feast of the Passover; which yet, as we had apparently good reason to believe, was filled up either by a studied privacy, such as the occasion required, or by a stationary abode in Capernaum. During the second year there was no proof of any interruption whatever; it was full of action and employment throughout. The same observation holds good of the first two months of the third: and the remaining four, belonging to the first half of this year, were passed as before either in an intentional seclusion, or in a residence of greater or less continuance at Capernaum.

In this period upon the whole we have discovered clear evidences of *three general*, and at least *two partial* circuits; the two last of the *general*, and each of the *partial* within the compass of the same year; and the first of the *general* during the first six months of the year before it. All these were begun originally

from Capernaum, and all were terminated finally at Capernaum, and all were confined to the precincts of Galilee. The ministry of our Lord, during the whole of this period, was so strictly limited to Galilee, that, excepting the single occasions when he visited Jerusalem, we have no proof that he was ever out of it; we have no proof that he once crossed the lake before the middle of his second year; nor that he visited Decapolis, Tyre, or Sidon, or journeyed in the dominions of Philip, before the beginning of his third: nor even then expressly and formally for his usual purposes of teaching or preaching, but rather for the sake of privacy and concealment. In like manner we have no proof, at least from the first three Gospels, that he was ever in Peræa, until he is described as passing thither in the course of his last journey to Jerusalem; nor that he was ever in Samaria except on the two occasions, John iv. 4—early in his first year—and Luke ix. 52, late in his third: and as to the occasions when he was resident in Judæa, or visiting Jerusalem, they have been considered already by themselves.

During the first half of the third year in particular, though it may be assumed as certain that, almost the whole of the time, our Lord was constantly journeying from place to place, yet it is also certain that he was not journeying upon a circuit; or strictly speaking, with a view to the usual functions of his ministry at all: so that we have no proof as yet of any fourth circuit within this period, similar to those which preceded in the two former years. Different as our Lord's conduct, for thus much of the present year, may consequently seem in comparison of his conduct heretofore; it is not more so than in comparison with his conduct for the remainder of this year itself: a circum-

stance which proves indisputably that he had motives for desiring the concealment of his person, and suspending the course of his ministry, affecting this portion of its duration, but none before or after it.

These motives, it is probable, were twofold; partly to escape from the excitement of the multitude on what had been hitherto the exclusive theatre of his personal agency; lest the accumulated effect of so many wonderful works, combined with their own ardent, but unfounded hopes and expectations, now grown more enthusiastic than ever; should lead them to some rash act, such as openly casting off the Roman yoke, and declaring Jesus their king: partly to avoid the society of his enemies, the Scribes and Pharisees, who had long been resolved upon his death, and waited only for a favourable opportunity of effecting it. Hence it was that, for a considerable interval of time, he continued to travel in parts where he was comparatively a stranger—and possibly might not be recognized; whether also the Pharisees were not likely to follow him, or if they did, where they would have less influence than in Galilee or in Judæa. The effect of a protracted absence might be to abate the ardour, and to diminish the expectations of the common people, on the one hand; and to dispense with the necessity of our Lord's preserving his life from the malice and machinations of his enemies, by supernatural means, on the other. It was the least of two evils to abstain, for a time, from coming in contact with his adversaries, and exasperating their hostility to its utmost pitch, until the purposes of the divine Providence were ripe for execution; instead of suffering those purposes to be prematurely accelerated, or of frustrating the ebullitions of sudden violence by actual recourse to miracle. With the last six months however of the present year; that

is, from the time where the review of our Lord's ministry previously has been brought to a close; the period was either arrived, or at hand, during which the course of external events, considered as the instrumental or secondary means, by which the same Providence designed to work in the gradual consummation of its own effects, was to be so controlled and accelerated as to terminate naturally in his death. With the arrival of this period then the season of temporary precaution or concealment was past, and our Lord had no longer any measures to keep with his enemies: and it will be seen accordingly that he again appears in public, even among those whom he had hitherto seemed most to avoid, with more openness, regularity, and boldness, than he had ever assumed before.

DISSERTATION XXIV.

Comparison of the call of the four disciples (Matt. iv. 18—22. Mark i. 16—20.) and of the miraculous draught of fishes, (Luke v. 1—11.)

THE differences observable between the history of the miraculous draught of fishes in St. Luke, and the account of the call of the four disciples, Andrew and Peter, James and John, in St. Matthew or in St. Mark, are the following; which I shall be satisfied with simply laying before the reader. Afterwards I shall leave him to decide upon them for himself, whether the occasions, to which each of these narratives respectively relates, can possibly be the same.

I. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Jesus before the call was *walking* by the shore of the sea; according to St. Luke he was *standing* by the lake of Gennesaret: according to the former he was alone, or at least was doing nothing at the time; according to the latter there was a multitude about him, which he was preparing to teach.

II. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, he never quitted the land; according to St. Luke, he went on board a ship: according to the former he continued to walk on along the shore; according to the latter he actually put out to sea.

III. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, both the ships were first seen *upon* the sea; according to St. Luke they were seen drawn up on the shore: according to the former, they were seen one after the other, and in different situations on the sea; according to the latter, they were seen both together, and in the same situation on the land.

IV. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Andrew and Simon were seen first in their ship, and then James and John in their's; according to St. Luke, neither were seen in either; the fishermen had left both the ships. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Andrew and Simon were seen *letting down* their net, James and John, *preparing* to let down their's; according to St. Luke, they were all seen washing their nets on the shore. In the one case they were all beginning to fish; in the other they had all done fishing.

V. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, Simon and Andrew, as the first seen, were the first called; and as seen by themselves, were called by themselves; and then James and John; according to St. Luke, if seen at all, or called at all, they were all seen together, and all called together.

VI. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, the call in each case was made *from* the land; according to St. Luke it was made in the *midst* of the sea: according to the former, Simon and Andrew (and very probably James and John) were called in these terms^a—δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἀλιεῖς, or γενέσθαι ἀλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων: according to the latter, if any were called, they were called in these^b—μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν: according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, they were called at twice, each two of them distinctly from the other; according to St. Luke, if any were called, all were called at once, and all in the person of one.

VII. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, in obeying the call Simon and Andrew forsook only their nets; James and John only their ship; according to St. Luke, they all forsook every thing; their nets, their ships, and the booty which they had taken. Nor could these representations, however different, be otherwise. It

^a Matt. iv. 19. Mark i. 17.

^b Ch. v. 10.

is plain, according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, that the disciples could have had nothing more as yet to forsake, than their ships or their fishing-tackle; for they were only beginning to fish, and had not made any cast. But according to St. Luke, they had just enclosed a prodigious draught.

VIII. According to St. Matthew and St. Mark, the effect ensued in obedience to an invitation; the disciples forsook what they did forsake, because Jesus bade them follow him: according to St. Luke, it was a voluntary act; they forsook what they did forsake, of their own accord.

I am well aware that, among these various inconsistencies of statement, there are some which the tortuous ingenuity of criticism, aided by an unscrupulous facility of supposition in the addition of circumstances not expressed, and therefore gratuitous; might perhaps explain, and smooth down to an agreement: but there are more which no dexterity of accommodation, or laxity of interpretation, would be able to render otherwise than, *recta fronte*, at variance with each other: and taken all together they constitute a chain of facts which, as so many evidences of distinctness, or as what logicians would call *circumstantiæ individuantes*, must be indissoluble. Yet, in addition to these considerations, we may add the following also.

I. It is morally certain from St. Matthew and St. Mark^c, that the parties to whom they allude were just beginning to fish; and from St. Luke^d, that they whom he speaks of had just done fishing. Moreover, the time of the transaction in St. Luke was evidently the morning^e; and consequently the previous fishing had been going on in the night. It was begun therefore the evening before. And that evening was na-

^c Matt. iv. 18. 21. Mark i. 16. 19.

^d Luke v. 2.

^e Ib. 5.

turally the time, when fishermen on the lake would ordinarily begin to fish, may be concluded not only from the reason of the thing; (that they would commonly begin then, when the inhabitants of the deep are known, by experience, to be most active, and most on the alert, and therefore the most likely to be caught*;) but also from an instance in point, which is seen to have been begun in the evening—and like this to have lasted until the morning^f. The time of the call then in St. Matthew or St. Mark, as we may take it for granted, was the evening; but that of the miracle in St. Luke was unquestionably the morning. At this season of the year, which I have supposed to be after the feast of Pentecost, U.C. 780, that is, after May 30, the Jewish evening, which began at sunset, would begin about 8 P. M.: and the Jewish morning, which began at sunrise, would begin about 4 A. M.: and those, who had commenced their labours on the lake, at

* Aristotle, *De Animalibus*, ix. xx. 10: ἀλίσκονται δὲ μάλιστα οἱ ἰχθύες πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς, καὶ μετὰ δύσιν· ὅλως δὲ περὶ δυσμὰς ἡλίου καὶ ἀνατολὰς· οὗτοι γὰρ λέγονται εἶναι ὠραῖοι βόλοι· διὸ καὶ τὰ δίκτυα ταύτην τὴν ὥραν ἀναιροῦνται οἱ ἀλιεῖς· μάλιστα γὰρ ἀπατῶνται οἱ ἰχθύες τῇ ὥρῃ κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς· τῆς μὲν γὰρ νυκτὸς ἡσυχάζουσι, πλείονος δὲ γιγνομένου τοῦ φωτὸς μᾶλλον ὀρώσι. Oppian, *Cy-negeticων* iv. 139: ὥς δ' ἰχθὺς ἀνὰ νύκτα δολόφρονες ἀσπαλῆες | πρὸς βόλον ἰθύνουσι, θοαῖς ἀκάτοισι φέροντες | λαμπομένας δαΐδας, τοὶ δὲ τρεῖουσιν ἰδόντες | ἔλλοπες, οὐδὲ μένουσιν ἐλίσσομένην ἀμαρυγὴν. *Hal-lienticων* iii. 50: θήρη δ' ἐσπερίῃ μὲν ὀπωρινῇσιν ἐν ὥραις | καρτίστη

τελέθει, καὶ ἑωσφόρος εὖτ' ἀνατέλλῃ· | χεῖματι δ' ἡελίοιο βολαῖς ἅμα κιδναμένῃσι | στέλλεσθαι· πᾶν δ' ἡμαρ ἐν εἴαρι τηλεθῶντι | ἀγρῆς παντοίῃσιν ὀφέλλεται· ἡμος ἅπαντες | ἔλλοπες ἡῖόνεσσιν ἐφέστιοι ἐγγύθι γαίης | ἔλκονται τεκέων τε μόγῳ δίψῃ τ' ἀφροδίτης. An allusion to the early plying of their craft by fishermen, occurs in the *Anthology*, in a supposed epitaph on a dead body discovered by fishermen, and brought home: αἰάξω Πολύανθον, ὃν εὐνέτις, ᾧ παραμείβων, | νύμφιον ἐν τύμβῳ θῆκεν Ἀρισταγόρη . . . | δύσμορον, ὀρθρινοὶ μιν ἐπεὶ, νέκυν ἰχθοβολῆς, | ξεῖνε, *Τορωναίων* εἴλκυσαν εἰς λιμένα. *Anthologia*, i. 193. *Phædimi* iv.

the first of those periods, being unsuccessful, might naturally continue them until the latter. It was a familiar practice with the people of the East to take their morning's repast at *πρωὶ*, or sunrise, throughout the year; and among other modes of making it, anciently as well as still, one was to repair to the water-side, and breakfast on the newly-taken fish. The instance referred to from St. John is an illustration of this fact*.

II. It came to pass, says St. Luke ε, as he was standing by the side of the lake of Gennesaret, that he saw two ships, drawn up on the shore; and having entered into one of them, *which was Simon's*, he prayed him to put back a little from the land. Now this mention of the name of Simon is clearly in allusion to iv. 38. before; and supposes it to be already known to the reader from that. But even the mention of the name *there* would be much too abrupt and indefinite, were there not, throughout the Gospel of St. Luke, a tacit reference to the Gospel of St. Matthew or of St. Mark. From either of those Gospels it might

* Plutarch, *Operum* viii. 654. *Symposiaca*, iv. 4: τί δ' οἱ πολλοὶ βούλονται πρὸς θεῶν, ὅταν ἡδέως γενέσθαι παρακαλοῦντες ἀλλήλους, λέγωσι· Σήμερον ἀκτάσωμεν; οὐχὶ τὸ παρ' ἀκτῇ δεῖπνον ἡδιστον ἀποφαίνουσιν, ὥσπερ ἐστίν; οὐ διὰ τὰ κύματα καὶ τὰς ψηφίδας... ἀλλ' ὡς ἰχθύος ἀφθόνου καὶ νεαροῦ τῆς παραλίου τραπέξης εὐπορούσης.

Mr. Harmer, vol. iii. ch. iv. Obs. lix. 205, illustrates this passage from Doubdan. Quintilian, vii. iii. 31: Juvenes, qui convivere solebant, constituerunt ut in litore cœnarent. Vide also Cicero, *De Officiis*, iii. 14. Cf. Dio Chry-

sostom, xxx. 558. 15—20.

Ἦδη καὶ ῥόδον ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀκμάζων ἐρέβινθος, | καὶ κανλοὶ κράμβης, Σώσυλε, πρωτοτόμου, | καὶ μαινὴ λαλαγεῦσα, καὶ ἀρτιπαγῆς ἀλίτυρος^h, | καὶ θριδάκων οὐλῶν ἀκροφυῇ πέταλα. | ἡμεῖς δ' οὐτ' ἀκτῆς ἐπιβαίνομεν, οὐτ' ἐν ἀπόψει | γίνομεθ', ὡς αἰεὶ, Σώσυλε, τὸ πρότερον. | καὶ μὴν Ἀντιγένης καὶ Βάκχιος ἐχθὲς ἔπαιζον· | νῦν δ' αὐτοὺς θάψαι σήμερον ἐκφέρομεν. *Anthologia*, ii. 78. *Philodemi* xxx. The above is an invitation to spend a spring day on the shore of the sea, enforced by the consideration of the uncertainty and shortness of life.

ε Ch. v. 1—3.

^h Cf. vol. iii. 119. *Palladæ Alexandrini* xxi. lines 8, 9. It seems to describe what we should call a *cream cheese*.

certainly be known who Simon was, prior even to the allusion at Luke iv. 38; and consequently his name might there be mentioned as a well-known one, even with no previous allusion or additional description. It is implied therefore in this account that, before the transaction to which it relates, our Saviour and Simon were already acquainted; and were understood by St. Luke's readers to be so.

III. The call in St. Luke was preceded by an act of teaching; which was consequently either the first of its kind, that had yet taken place, or not the first. If it was the first, then our Saviour had not yet begun his ministry in public; and if he had not yet begun his ministry in public, though he might now have called certain persons to be his disciples, he could not now have been surrounded by a multitude. If it was not the first, he must have already begun his ministry; and he might consequently be surrounded by a multitude. But from Acts i. 21. 22, a passage which we have had occasion to produce elsewhere^h, it must be certain that he had previously called the four disciples.

IV. The anxiety of the people, on this occasion, to press upon our Lord, is a parallel instance to Mark iii. 9, 10. iv. 1, and to other instances, which might be produced, both in the motive, viz. their desire to hear him or to come close to him; and in the effect, viz. that it made it necessary he should retire on board a ship, and address them from the sea. On all these other occasions it may be observed in common, that they are decidedly later than the commencement of our Lord's ministry in general; and if the present instance of teaching happened after the first circuit of Galilee, it would be so far in unison with the rest. Nor indeed

^h Vol. i. 355. Dissertation x.

could it be otherwise, especially at the very outset of his ministry. To have attracted crowds in such numbers ; to have produced this importunate eagerness to get about our Lord, or to hear him, so as to make it necessary that he should retire beyond their reach : his reputation must have been spread far and wide ; he must have become generally known as a prophet or teacher, and as a performer of wonderful works. Now this never could have been the case, before the intervention of one public progress over Galilee at least.

Besides, it is utterly incredible that, when preparing to begin his ministry by teaching the word of God, our Lord would make choice of the lake of Capernaum, and the locality of a fisherman's boat, instead of the city, and the synagogue itself. His preaching and teaching, even upon the first circuit, were confined to the synagogues of Galilee ; nor is there any proof that he taught in the open air, except towards the close of the progress, when he delivered the sermon from the mount. The truth indeed is, that he called the disciples in question, before he began to teach, that is, to enter on the work of his ministry any where ; and when he began to teach, or to enter on the work of his ministry, it was in that place, the synagogue of Capernaum ; and on that day, the day of the sabbath ; which from the piety of our Lord, and with very few exceptions, from his uniform practice ever after, it might naturally be expected that it would be. And as he first began to teach *there* and *then*, so the first miracle, in confirmation of his teaching, was wrought *there* and *then*.

V. The mere perusal of the narrative from v. 1—4, is sufficient to satisfy an unprejudiced reader that the instance of teaching, now recorded, was in the ordinary discharge of our Lord's ministerial functions. He was

teaching as a matter of course; he was preparing to do nothing which he had never yet done before, when the people were resorting to him. He had often taught *them*, and they had as often been taught by *him*, before they were addressed on this occasion.

VI. The manner of our Saviour's teaching was distinguished by a peculiar property, which the Evangelists designate as the teaching of one ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ: as the manner which would be assumed by one, who had a right to command, and a right to be obeyed; who was entitled to an implicit deference to his *own* word and will; who was authorized both to teach men their duty, and to expect their performance of what he taught. Now this manner was so novel and striking, that each of the Gospel historians, except St. John, has distinctly noticed it; but what is not less remarkable, has noticed it *once* for all: having specified it in a single instance they never recur to it again. That single instance however is also the *first* instance: the occasion, on which they do notice it, is the *first* occasion which it came within the scope of their accounts to record: and both these things, *a priori*, were very naturally to be expected. A constant identical property of our Saviour's teaching might justly be specified once for all; but if it were to be specified once for all, that single occasion would most naturally and most fitly be the first. Now the instance of teaching on the lake is accompanied by no such characteristic remark; whence we may infer it could not have been the *first*: but the instance, recorded before that, in the synagogue of Capernaum, it is absolutely certain, isⁱ: whence it would be a similar inference that that instance was the *first*. If so, the teaching in the synagogue preceded in point of time the teaching

ⁱ Luke iv. 32.

on the lake. The one is clearly the first on record in St. Luke, and might be the first ἀπλῶς: the other is not. But the call of the disciples preceded even that teaching in the synagogue. Much more, then, did that call precede this teaching on the lake.

VII. St. Peter addresses our Saviour by the title of ἐπιστάτης^k; the use of which term is one of the idioms of St. Luke. In his Gospel it occurs six times; but in no other Gospel besides; and it occurs always as personally directed to our Saviour; and in every instance but the last, as addressed to him by the apostles, in the sense of ῥαββί, or διδάσκαλος—the ordinary title which disciples, among the Jews, every where gave to their masters. The use of the term then is peculiar to the relation of master and of disciple; so that on this principle Peter was a disciple already, at the very time when he is supposed to receive his call. And according to my distribution of the preceding events, this was truly the case; for he had been called four or five months before: but on any supposition which should make his original call accompany the miraculous draught, there must be so far an absurdity.

Nor is this all: for the same text proves that Peter was acquainted with the *power* of our Saviour; and that however unsuccessful they had been until then, yet if they let down the net at his command, they could not fail to enclose a draught. It is clearly implied, therefore, that he knew our Saviour to be capable of performing miracles; and consequently that he had seen him perform miracles before. On our principles this also would necessarily be the case: for besides the miracles which he must have witnessed in Capernaum^l, (one of them wrought upon his own wife's mother,) *before* the commencement of the circuit; he must have

^k Luke v. 5.

^l Ch. iv. 33—41.

had ocular testimony of a vast number more, performed upon the circuit itself^m. But upon any other supposition, how could the same thing be the case? If the disciples had never yet received a call, could they yet have seen a miracle? Would not the miracle, which now ensued, and which had not yet been performed, be the very first miracle on record any where, except in St. John? Ever after *this* miracle they might well have had an entire confidence in the supernatural power of Jesus; but how could they have it before?

It is true, as we perceive from the result, that St. Peter appears surprised even at his own success. But this does not prove that he expected *no* miracle, but only that he did not expect *such* a miracle; that the success which he experienced exceeded his most sanguine hopes. Hence his first, and his most natural impression was that of awe; as in the presence of a superior Being. The admiration of the effect was lost in the contemplation of the cause; and he fell down at the feet of Jesus, as a sinful man would prostrate himself before his all-pure and almighty Creator.

VIII. If the miraculous draught was really a part of the transaction of the call, there is no reason to be conceived or to be assigned for its omission. A miracle like this, the first instance of any miracle in the three original Gospels; a miracle expressly wrought for the conviction of the four first and chief of the apostles; was surely, on every account, deserving of a distinct notice. Besides, without the history of the miracle the history of the call would have been not only incomplete, but unintelligible. The call, upon this principle, must have arisen out of the miracle, and the miracle must have introduced the call; the call must have applied the miracle, and the miracle have justified the call. Nei-

^m Matt. iv. 23. 24.

ther then would be perfect without the other ; nor could the end proposed by the history of the one be attained except in conjunction with the account of the other.

IX. The foundation of the whole mistake, with respect to the presumed Trajection in St. Luke, is the assumption that the account of the miraculous draught is an account of the call of the four parties who witnessed it ; an assumption altogether precarious. For that the words addressed to Peter convey no call must be self-evident ; and that none is implied in the material fact itself, appears from this consideration, viz. that the very same kind of miracle, on the very same sea of Galilee, and in behalf of most, if not of all of the very same persons ; was again performed after the resurrectionⁿ. If therefore it implied a call *now*, it must have implied a call *then* ; that is, the apostles were not called until after the resurrection.

The truth is this. The miracle was a symbolical act, and contained a latent prophecy : the import of the symbol being the future success of these same persons as apostles, who had had such success as fishermen. It illustrated therefore in respect to their future character and employment, certain truths ; all adumbrated by something correspondent at present : the weakness of the instrumental agency, the efficiency of the accompanying power ; each made distinctly visible in the grandeur, and consequently the disparity of the result. They had been as fishermen the instruments of Christ in letting down the net and enclosing the fish ; and they should be as apostles his instruments also in propagating the Gospel and catching mankind. In the former capacity, as left to themselves they had been able to do nothing ; as assisted by him they had made a

ⁿ John xxi. 1—6.

prodigious capture. And as the emissaries of the Gospel, unaccompanied by Christ they would be able to effect still less ; as endowed and assisted by him, they should evangelize the world. It was faith in the Divine cooperation which led to their success now ; it would be faith in the same cooperation which should lead to their still more splendid success hereafter.

It may be said, however, that a symbolical miracle, containing such a moral end as this, might very fitly precede or accompany an original call. But this original call, as we shall see elsewhere, was not a call to become apostles, but merely to become disciples ; and those, who had been called in the latter capacity, were yet not ordained in the former, until at least a year afterwards. A transaction therefore like the present, which as concerned disciples was not so much a call, as the ratification of a call, and as concerned apostles, was not so much an ordination, as an intimation of an approaching ordination ; comes in most significantly and most appositely where St. Luke has placed it ; *after* the one, and *before* the other.

The true light, then, in which we ought to regard it is that of something which bears an equal relation to the situation of the four parties, both as still disciples, and as sometime to become apostles. It is not a call for the first time addressed to them, but the confirmation of a call already received : it is not an appointment to the office of an apostle, but an implied indication of such an appointment ere long. The language of our Lord in St. Luke, as we saw, was not to be reconciled to his language in St. Matthew or St. Mark : the latter did strictly convey a call, the former no such thing. Yet each declaration, under the circumstances of its own account, is so natural and proper, that in the estimation of any candid judge this alone would be sufficient

to vouch for the reality of either ; and yet its distinctness from the other. When Jesus saw Peter and Andrew, in St. Matthew or St. Mark, they were only beginning to fish, and had yet enclosed nothing : he calls them therefore, as he could call them, solely in allusion to their occupation ; Come after me, and I will make you fishers of men. When Jesus speaks to Peter, in St. Luke, he had just made a wonderful draught : Jesus addresses him therefore in allusion to his recent success—Henceforth, thou shalt be catching men.

There would still be so much affinity between the final end of the present transaction, and the ultimate design of the original call, that St. Luke, who proposed to relate the one, might very well be induced to omit the other ; especially as two of the Evangelists had recorded that, but both had passed over this. We may now perceive also the distinct force and meaning of that additional circumstance, in his account ; viz. that the four disciples, having brought their ships to land, *forsook all* and followed Jesus. This was not said before ; and the reason is that their call was either not fully completed, or not fully comprehended until now. It is not surprising that, though called as disciples by our Lord himself, yet as mere disciples, placed only on a footing of equality with many others, who had attached themselves to him of their own accord ; even these four should not all at once consider it necessary, (especially in the first year of our Saviour's ministry, and during the times when they were stationary at Capernaum,) to give up their usual occupations, or to bid adieu to every worldly concern but the business of attending on him. This was what multitudes never did, who yet were our Lord's disciples during the whole course of his ministry ; and this was what the apostles, had they always continued in the

simple estate of disciples, nowise distinguished from the rest, never could have been expected to do. Henceforth however they devoted themselves wholly to Jesus ; they began to be convinced that their original call had some greater, and more exclusive end in view : and to act upon that conviction. Now, then, it might first be said, Lo ! we have forsaken all things, and followed thee ; what therefore shall be our's ? And among the other moral uses of the present narrative, this may reasonably be considered one ; viz. to do that justice to the faith and the self-denial of Christian apostles, which their own modesty had not allowed them to do to themselves ; by shewing under what peculiar circumstances of temptation to the contrary ; viz. after a rich and valuable capture ; they were induced to give up every thing, for the sake of attaching themselves to Jesus.

I think, then, it must now be admitted that, beyond these moral uses, (the proper exemplification of which was still future,) the history of the miraculous draught has nothing in common with the account of the call of Simon and Andrew, James and John : and if so, that there is no proof of a Trajection in this part of St. Luke. Nor is this conclusion of slight importance. The disproof of a transposition in the present instance ought to facilitate the eviction of the same conclusion in other instances ; for there is not perhaps a single instance of a supposed irregularity which has been more confidently assumed than this : with what reason I leave the reader to judge. But if this is no such thing—others also, however confidently they may have been assumed, which yet, *a priori*, are not more presumptively so than this, may turn out upon examination to be quite the reverse.

DISSERTATION XXV.

On the call of Levi, and the entertainment which followed the call: or Mark ii. 13—22. Luke v. 27—39. compared with Matt. ix. 9—17.

THE call of Matthew the Publican, who is designated by the name of Levi also *, must be assigned to the first year, and to the last six months of the first year, of our Saviour's ministry; and even as so assigned took place probably nearer to the end, than to the beginning of that time. It does not however follow from this fact that he was not yet a disciple, by which I understand a simple believer in Christ; much less that he was not yet even acquainted with our Lord: but merely that he had not received any personal call; that he had not given up his usual occupations, whatsoever they were, to attach himself to Christ.

The readiness with which he obeys the call is in fact a proof that he was predisposed for its reception, and consequently was a disciple of our Lord already in the same sense, and to the same effect, as many others, both before and after the present time, who yet never received a personal invitation from our Lord himself. The calls of any among the apostles, as ascribed to our Saviour and left on record, were not

* No one, I apprehend, will be seriously disposed to question the identity of Matthew and Levi; notwithstanding the difference of name. It is not, therefore, of much importance, that Origen, i. 376. D. Contra Celsum, i. 62, says, Levi was not of the number of the apostles, *εἰ μὴ κατὰ τινα τῶν ἀντιγρά-*

φων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου: or that Heracleo, apud Clement Alex. i. 595. 30—33. Strom. iv. 9: distinguished him from Matthew. See also Eusebius, Demonstratio Evangelica, ix. 439. B.

Chrysostom and Theophylact, on the other hand, considered them the same.

invitations to become disciples in the strictest sense of that term, such as could be applicable to none except to persons before unacquainted with himself; but a personal compliment to the parties in question, such as might be paid, for special reasons, even to those who were believers previously. Nor is Matt. viii. 22, or Luke ix. 59, any difficulty; unless it could be shewn that these were calls addressed to persons not yet disciples, or even not yet ordained apostles; all of whom had certainly been appointed to their office long before the time of either of these incidents, and especially that of the last. On this account, more particularly, I am persuaded that every instance of a personal call, as addressed to those who were first disciples and afterwards became apostles, has been carefully placed on record; and consequently that such instances are five in number, four of the disciples called at the beginning of the year, and this of St. Matthew at its end. In all these cases it is the effect, which ensued upon the call, not the mere call itself, that we are bound chiefly to attend to. St. Matthew had not yet renounced his secular occupation; he was sitting at the Publican's booth, or the receipt of custom, when he was accosted by Christ: he rose up in obedience to the invitation; and from that time forward forsook every thing to follow him.

The call of Matthew, considered as the same person with Levi, is related by each of the first three Evangelists; though by St. Matthew it is related out of its place. In each of them also there follows, upon the history of the call, an account of an entertainment, which St. Mark and St. Luke distinctly ascribe to Levi, and in direct connection with his previous call; but which St. Matthew does not less clearly refer to the time of the return from Gadara, and just before

the application of Jairus, followed by the raising of his daughter. As both this application and the subsequent miracle are related in their proper place by St. Mark and by St. Luke, and that at a part of their narrative which comes much later than the present; it follows that, if this entertainment was the same in each of these instances, they have admitted an Anticipation by giving an account of it here. But as I cannot acquiesce in this conclusion, it becomes incumbent upon me to shew that the occasions themselves were, in all probability, distinct.

I. It is clearly implied in St. Mark and St. Luke ^a, that the entertainment which they record was given in the *house* of Levi: but it is by no means certain that the entertainment, recorded by St. Matthew, took place in the same. Matthew ix. 10, which is all the allusion to the house in question supplied by his account, alludes to the house where our Saviour was accustomed to reside in Capernaum: it is manifestly the same house, which is implied or mentioned in many other passages ^b, after a similar manner; viz. the house of his ordinary residence. The very use of the article in speaking of it so repeatedly ἀπλως, demonstrates the same conclusion; for the article would not be thus used except of some well known and definite house; nor could any house be such except the stated place of our Lord's abode. Now unless this house was Levi's or Matthew's from the first, the entertainment, Matt. ix. 10, given in this house, could not have been given in the house of Levi. But if it was not given in the house of Levi, it could not be the same with the entertainment of Levi, which was certainly given in the house of Levi. And that this house was not the house

^a Luke v. 29. Mark ii. 15.
xii. 46. xiii. 1. 36. xvii. 25.

^b Mark ii. 1. iii. 19. 31. Matt. ix. 2. 28.

of Levi from the first may be collected from Mark ii. 1, and Matt. ix. 2. 9, which shew that our Lord was in the habit of using or frequenting this house before even the call of Levi himself. The truth is that, if it was the house of any disciple, it was that of Simon or of Andrew, not of Levi or Matthew^c.

II. The entertainment given by Levi, as recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke, not only followed after his call, but as it is plainly intended to be understood, was meant by way of an acknowledgment of his call. But the entertainment in St. Matthew was at least six months later than the call; and even subsequently to the call, the mere invitation to become a disciple had been succeeded by a much greater distinction; the ordination of Matthew to the rank of an apostle. What would be more natural than that a mark of respect or gratitude, designed in acknowledgment of the call, should have ensued immediately upon it? what more unnatural, and more improbable than that the call should have taken place six months before, and the entertainment, which commemorated it, be celebrated six months after? Nothing but the most special reasons could have produced this anomaly, or accounted for the unnatural interval, under such circumstances, between the cause and its natural effect: and the existence of any such reasons would have been the strongest of arguments for keeping the two things as distinct in the account, as they were in themselves; for relating the call in one place, and the entertainment, which arose out of the call, in another.

III. It would be in vain to deny the truth of the assumption, on which this reasoning is founded; viz. that the entertainment of Levi was intimately connected with the call of Levi; and therefore that the

^c Matt. viii. 14. Mark i. 29. Luke iv. 38.

time and occasion of the former were necessarily the time and occasion of the latter. The accounts of both the Evangelists place this assumption beyond a question. But, even though the entertainment had been entirely independent of the call, still this would be no inducement purposely to antedate the account of the former, in order to join it to that of the latter; but quite the contrary: for it would be to establish a connection between them which really did not exist, nor ever was supposed to exist. Nor can it be said that the Evangelists have agreed to blend both the accounts in one, with a view to preserve unbroken the history of the same person: because both the incidents had some reference to Levi. The truth is that the history of the entertainment has nothing at all to do with the history of Levi. It is given purely and solely on its own account, and from its connection with the history of our Lord.

The entertainment was rendered memorable by two circumstances which transpired at it; the exception, for the first time taken, against the condescension of Christ in eating with publicans and sinners; and the question, for the first time put, concerning a breach of the law of tradition apparently sanctioned by his example, which breach related to fastings. Both these exceptions were such, as in the nature of things could transpire only at some feast, or when our Saviour, in some house or other, was sitting at meat: but at what feast it might be, or in what house he might be sitting at meat, would be perfectly indifferent and purely accidental.

The course of events, however, from this time forward (which was the close of our Lord's first year); before the return from Gadara (which coincided with the middle of his second); will furnish a case in point

to shew that such exceptions, and on such grounds, had already begun to be taken against our Saviour, and to be matter of public notoriety: which case, if the account given of the feast of Levi is regular where it stands, even the Gospel of St. Luke proves to be critically apposite and just; but on no other principle whatever. In the history of our Lord's reflections, as they ensued upon the message of John and the departure of his messengers, ἰδοὺ, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης^d, can be understood of nothing but his supposed contempt of the law of fastings; and, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν, of nothing but his alleged promiscuous intercourse with persons of that description. Each of these, if Luke v. 30 and 33 had really preceded, would be explained at once; but if it had not, would be little better than unintelligible.

IV. The entertainment, which was given by Levi, is called δοχὴ μεγάλη^e; a description which can scarcely imply less than the principal meal of the day. Now this meal universally among the ancients, and at this period of ancient history more especially, was the last meal in the day; that is, the meal of supper. If so, the feast given by Levi was a supper; and consequently the feast intended at Matt. ix. 10, if it was the same with that, was a supper also. The application then of Jairus made *at* this feast was made *at* a supper: his daughter therefore was raised; the issue of blood was stanch'd; the blind men were restored to sight; the demoniac was dispossessed; all in the night-time as such: which is a tissue of absurdities from first to last.

Besides this, I have shewn elsewhere^f that the return from Gadara, Matt. ix. 1, just before the feast,

^d Luke vii. 34.^e Ch. v. 29.^f Supra, 335—339. Dissertation xxv.

took place in the morning; and certainly not at night: the feast in St. Matthew, then, might be the usual morning's meal, or if not, the noonday's meal; but on no principle a supper. But if it was the morning's meal, or that of the fifth hour of the day, it could not be the feast of Levi; for that feast was a *great feast*; but the morning's repast and that of noon, were the simplest and lightest in the day, and therefore not *great* feasts. Besides which, the idea of a great feast conceived, prepared for, and executed between the short interval of landing on the beach at Capernaum, and receiving the application of Jairus; as the feast of Levi, in this case, must have been; is little better than the idea of an impossibility. That there was no great interval between the return from Gadara, and the arrival of Jairus, may be concluded from this consideration alone; that two of the Evangelists, St. Mark and St. Luke, connect these facts so closely together, that they have been thought even to contradict St. Matthew; as though Jairus met our Saviour upon the shore of the lake, and he had not had time actually to go to his house. Nor can it be said that Levi was perhaps aware of the intended return from Gadara; and made his preparations accordingly before the departure thither. If Levi was Matthew, Matthew also must have gone to Gadara; and as I have shewn elsewhere both the visit to Gadara, and the return from thence, were equally unexpected events; which no one but our Saviour himself could have foreseen, or been prepared for at the time.

V. Upon a certain occasion ^g, where the context fixes the import of the declaration to the sacrifice of temporal possessions, Simon Peter in his own name, and in the name of the rest of the apostles, says to our

^g Matt. xix. 27.

Lord, Lo ! we have forsaken, *or* renounced all things : and followed thee. The answer of Jesus, recognizing the fact of the sacrifice and promising a corresponding reward, establishes the truth of the declaration. From the time then when the apostles became stated followers of our Saviour, they must have given up all that they had, or might have ; they must have bound themselves to a voluntary poverty ; they must have bidden adieu to their worldly possessions and worldly occupations, by which they had hitherto supported themselves, and by which they might otherwise have supported themselves still—on purpose to attend on Christ. Now it is surely inconsistent with this fact, and at variance also with the plain meaning of the Evangelist's assertion—Luke v. 28—that Matthew, who had forsaken *ᾗπαντα* in obedience to the call of Jesus, and thenceforward devoted himself to his Master's service, should yet, six months or more afterwards, have retained the means of giving him a *great* entertainment. *One* such entertainment, immediately *after* his call and in gratitude *for* his call, it is very possible that he might give ; but many such entertainments, and however long afterwards, if he had once forsaken all things, he never could give, nor ever be expected to give.

VI. The motive in fact of Levi's feast, if it was really such as we suppose, is so natural and becoming as almost of itself to establish the point in dispute : in which case the modesty of St. Matthew, who was Levi himself, might induce him to suppress the account of the feast, and consequently of what transpired at it, where both were so intimately connected with his own personal history. At another opportunity, however, if the same things happened again, and no longer possessed this relation to himself, he would be free to mention them. But with St. Mark and St. Luke the

state of the case would be just the reverse: they could have no such inducement to suppress the account of the feast and of its incidents at their first occurrence; yet having recorded them in their proper place before, they might justly be excused if they omitted to record them again. There is no good reason, but this, to be assigned why *two* independent authorities should each agree to give an arbitrary position to a matter of fact, which would have come equally well in its own place; much less why, in so doing, they should have set themselves apparently in opposition to a third and a prior authority, whose order was perfectly correct. A later Evangelist might rectify the transpositions of an earlier; but it is absurd to suppose that he would knowingly disturb his regular accounts. St. Mark and St. Luke are regular in their order every where else; why then should it be presumed that they were intentionally irregular here? Every body must see that, by omitting the account of the sitting at meat *after* the return from Gadara, but *before* the application of Jairus, they have exposed themselves *prima facie*, to the suspicion of an inconsistency with St. Matthew. It is not to be imagined that they would have incurred this risk for any reason, but one so natural as this; viz. that the intermediate particulars, however instructive, necessary, or curious, had all been actually anticipated. For it is a rule with them both; and especially with St. Luke; to record nothing of the same kind twice.

VII. If the circumstances of the two accounts be compared together, it will appear that neither the questions, which are seen to have been put, nor the answers, supposed to have been returned, on each occasion, were identical: and therefore that the occasions themselves may have been distinct.

I. St. Matthew's account of the circumstances of the

first question is this ; It came to pass, as he was sitting at meat in the house, that many publicans and sinners *came* and sate down, along with Jesus and his disciples : St. Luke's is this ; And Levi made a great entertainment for him in his own house ; and there was a great multitude of publicans, and of others, who were sitting at meat along with them. The former of these notices describes an *ordinary*, the second, an *extraordinary* occasion of the kind in question. The parties, who were guests along with Jesus and with his disciples, on the one, came of their own accord ; on the other, came because they had been invited. And this might well be. Into our Lord's *usual* place of abode even publicans and sinners might reasonably be encouraged to enter : into a strange house they would have access only by permission of the owner. Their presence in the former instance was doubtless due to the desire of hearing Jesus ; but their presence in the latter was much more probably the effect of their acquaintance with Levi ; who himself was one of their body.

II. At Matt. ix. 14, the disciples of John were present, and put the question there recorded *themselves* ; at Mark ii. 18, Luke v. 30. 33, it does not appear that the disciples of John were even present ; but it plainly appears that, whether present or not, they did not put the question themselves ; it was put by others concerning them. And this is a circumstance of distinction which can never be got over, and ought to be decisive of the question.

III. With regard to both the questions and the answers in each instance, St. Mark and St. Luke, who undoubtedly relate the same occurrence, agree more exactly with each other, than either of them with St. Matthew. But if they had each been relating the same things, this was not, *a priori*, to be expected : all

should have agreed alike, or all should have differed alike.

For example ; in the answer to the first question, the first part of ix. 13, which occurs in St. Matthew's account, does not occur in their's. Nor is it any objection that the same text is cited Matt. xii. 7, but wanting in the parallel places of Mark ii. 27, 28, and Luke vi. 4, 5 : for this second instance of its omission is not a case in point to the former. This text is the only omission in the present instance ; whereas there are other omissions also in the second : it must have been purposely excepted, and by itself, in the one ; only in common with more matter, in the other.

Should it be further objected that Luke v. 30 is not so close to Mark ii. 16, as Mark ii. 16 is to Matt. ix. 11, (the former as addressed to the disciples about *themselves* —both the latter as addressed to the disciples about *their Master*) the answer is, both questions were put ; Why the disciples were eating, and Why Christ was eating, with publicans and sinners. As it is, they amount to the same thing ; for a reproach that the disciples of Jesus did so and so was a reproach that their Master did the same : nor could the particular charge in the present instance be preferred against them, without including also him. They were all alike eating in the company of such persons ; and it was indifferent of whom the question might be asked.

Again, in reporting the answer to the second inquiry, at Matt. ix. 15, our Lord is described to use the remarkable term *πενθεῖν*, instead of *νηστεύειν*, as at Mark ii. 19 and Luke v. 34. These words were not synonymous either in themselves, or in the estimation of the parties who asked the question : to *fast* was not necessarily to *mourn*, especially as a mere formality,

as a stated part of the ceremonial of religion, but nothing more. In the use therefore of such a term, with respect to his own disciples, our Lord had an occasion in view, not yet indeed arrived but sometime to arrive, of more than mere formal fasting; an occasion of real grief and mourning, expressing themselves in the outward significant acts of fasting and prayer: an occasion which Theophylact (in locum) describes most correctly as follows: ἔσται οὖν καιρός, φησιν, ὅτε ἐμοῦ παθόντος, καὶ ἀναληφθέντος, νηστεύουσιν ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψῃ, διωκόμενοι^h. This propheticall allusion to the future sufferings of the Apostles, as we may justly contend, was too remarkable to be purposely omitted, yet too obscure to be purposely introduced. If our Lord, in St. Mark or in St. Luke, had made use of the word πενθεῖν, they would have retained it; if in St. Matthew, he had made use of νηστεύειν, St. Matthew would not have changed it.

St. Luke's account of the answer, in general, differs on the whole from St. Mark's, only as a supplementary might differ from a partial one; of which Luke v. 36, compared with Mark ii. 21, affords a luminous proof. I have little doubt that, as resulting from the harmony of both together, our Lord's words ought to stand exactly as follows: καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιρράπτει ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ καινὸν, τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεταιⁱ. εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει, καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ^k. The correctness of this arrangement is proved by the reason of the thing. The two arguments tend to the same *reductio ad absurdum*; but they are perfectly distinct from each

^h Operum i. 43. E. Commentarius in Matt. ix.

ⁱ Mark ii. 21.

^k Luke vi. 36.

other, and notwithstanding a like state of the case, suppose two very different consequences. The first goes on the assumption that an old garment cannot *sustain* a piece of new cloth; whence that, which is designed to fill up a rent, only enlarges it, and makes it worse than before: the second, on the assumption that an old garment will not *match* with a piece of new cloth; whence both the new is cut to provide a patch for the old, and the patch of new cloth, being put upon the old, will not suit to, or assort with the old.

Lastly; as to the objection from the antecedent improbability that two distinct occasions, requiring a defence in terms so much alike, should yet arise in the course of our Saviour's ministry; however great this improbability may be, it must still succumb to the evidence of the fact. But the improbability itself is not so great. No part of our Lord's public conduct was more uniformly on principle; nor consequently more uniformly obnoxious to the cavils of those who were disposed to find fault with it; than his unreserved intercourse with publicans and sinners. The passage quoted from Luke vii. 34. proves it to have soon become a standing reproach against him: and there are two other occasions, Luke vii. 36–50. xv. 1–10, both later in their occurrence than the present instance, upon which similar exceptions and the defence against them are found on record. As to the renewal of the question concerning fasting; if those who put it in the first instance were *not* the disciples of John, and those who put it in the second were *so*; the occasions must have been distinct. Such a question at that time was very possible *from* them; for John was not as yet put to death. But he had been long suffering imprison-

ment; and this may be one reason why our Lord, in answer to *their* question, made use of the word $\piενθείν$; which he did not use in his answer before to the former interrogation. *They* might have cause to fast and to mourn even *then*; his own disciples would have cause to do so only some time to come.

DISSERTATION XXVI.

On the ordination of the Twelve—and the Sermons from the Mount.

THE concurrent testimony of St. Mark and St. Luke establishes the fact that, until the present period of our Saviour's ministry, which is the first quarter of its second year; not only were the Twelve not yet ordained to their office, but even the name of Apostle was not yet in being. Hitherto then they were merely disciples; distinguished perhaps by nothing above the rest of the disciples in common, except that all, or some of them might have been personally called by our Saviour: as the rest of the disciples were not. But from this time forward they were expressly discriminated from the rest, and formed into a body or society of their own.

Of the ordination itself St. Matthew has given no account; though as far as the commencement of that circuit in the neighbourhood of the lake, of which the ordination appears to have been the conclusion, his narrative accompanies St. Mark's: and his silence is naturally to be explained by the consideration that he was himself one of the Twelve, and that it might not become the modesty of a Christian Apostle to record his own appointment, by the choice of Christ himself, to so high and so illustrious an office.

In a part of his Gospel, however, which follows not long after this time^a, he speaks of the Twelve, as of a body already in existence, and known by that name as such; whence it is clear that he recognises implicitly

^a Ch. x. 1.

the fact of their previous ordination. On the same occasion he introduces also the catalogue of their names; which agrees, upon the whole, with the lists of St. Mark and St. Luke: and the isolated yet natural manner, in which he brings in this catalogue^b, is a strong internal evidence that he kept it back in its proper place, only from a motive of genuine Christian humility. The same conclusion follows from the way in which even there he speaks of himself: for he puts his own name after that of Thomas; though according to the order of St. Mark and of St. Luke^c, it should have taken precedence of it; and he adds to his name the designation of *ὁ τελώνης*—a designation, in the opinion at least of his countrymen, expressive only of reproach; which the other two, with a becoming regard to the memory of a Christian Apostle, accordingly omit*.

As this event was the last, the most solemn, and the most important, which transpired in the course of the preceding circuit, the Gospel of St. Luke, which accompanied St. Mark's as far as the beginning of the circuit, but not further, rejoins it again at this point. If then the proof of a position like this, which seems to be so clearly established by the direct testimony of two Evangelists, and by the indirect testimony of a third; viz. that the appointment and ordination of the Twelve as Apostles were sometime posterior to their call as disciples; required any more confirmation: there are two distinct considerations, which place it beyond a question. First, the regular occurrence from this time forward, but never before it, of the phrase

* Eusebius reasons upon this circumstance in like manner, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii. v. pag. 119. D: 120. B. C.

^b Ch. x. 2—4.

^c Mark iii. 18. Luke vi. 15.

οἱ δώδεκα to express the Apostles, in opposition to the rest of the disciples; a phrase to be met with in St. Matthew eight times, in St. Mark ten times, and in St. Luke eight times. Besides this, there are instances also of the phrase οἱ δέκα, to express the rest of the Twelve in contradistinction to two; and of the phrase οἱ ἑνδεκα, to express them all but one: which consequently amount to the same thing. This uniformity of designation, which yet begins to appear only now and hereafter, must be a demonstrative argument that, until now and hereafter, there was no such distinction among our Lord's disciples in being, as that of some one body in particular, opposed to the rest in general. The very name of Apostle had not yet been bestowed upon any; the only person who bore it hitherto was our Lord himself, the Shiloh or Apostle of the Father: and if we look at the precise point of time at which, as it was, the Twelve were chosen, and at the use which was made of their services directly afterwards; it may be concluded that the imposition of the name on them now referred as much to something immediate, as to something remote; to their part and character of Gospel-missionaries during our Saviour's presence on earth, as much as after his ascension. St. Mark in particular declares that to have been the direct cause, and the primary purpose, or final end of their appointment^d: ἵνα ᾧσι μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους, καὶ ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια.

Secondly, the regular occurrence, from this time forward but not before it, of the name of Peter. St. Mark and St. Luke^e both shew that, when our Lord appointed Simon Barjonas an apostle, he gave him also,

^d Ch. iii. 14, 15.

^e Mark iii. 16. Luke vi. 14.

agreeably to a well-known custom of the East *, and to many similar instances which might be produced from the Old Testament, a *new* name, in allusion to his office itself; the name of Cephas or Peter: and it is a remarkable circumstance, displaying in an eminent degree the extreme accuracy of both these Evangelists, their strict attention to propriety, as well as to the truth and fidelity of history, in the least things not less than in the greatest; that speaking of him before this period, they invariably call him Simon; speaking of him after it, they as regularly call him Peter. His name of Simon, up to this time, occurs in St. Mark five times; but his name of Peter after it occurs eighteen times; in St. Luke, up to the same period, the former name occurs eight times; after it, the latter occurs eighteen times.

There is one exception, indeed, to the rule in St. Luke—at v. 8; at least if the reading in the text be genuine. But even there, the name of Peter is merely added to that of Simon; and after all, it is most probable that this addition itself was originally a marginal annotation, which some time or other crept into the text. As to St. Matthew, who did not intend to record, in its proper place, the appointment of the Twelve themselves, nor consequently the change of the name of any one of them; he introduces St. Peter^f by a reference to both his names, from the first; and, except in the catalogue of the apostles as such; to intimate that he really re-

* In Mr. Harmer's Observations (ii. 502—504. Chapter x. Obs. lvi.) there is a curious extract from sir John Chardin, shewing the prevalence of the same custom still among the Persians, and elsewhere in the East.

Chrysostom, however, (Operum, iv. 112. D. in Genesim Homilia xiv. 5.) observes that masters, who had just purchased slaves, as a sign of the right acquired over them, changed, if they pleased, their names.

^f Ch. iv. 18.

ceived the name of Peter first when he was first consecrated an Apostle; he speaks of him ever after by no name but that of Peter.

St. John's allusion to this name at i. 43 of his Gospel, as I have shewn elsewhere ^g, was entirely prospective. Our Lord's address to Peter at that time contained a *prophecy*, which was designed to have both a *literal*, and a *typical* fulfilment: a *literal*, when the name of Peter was actually substituted for the name of Simon; and a *typical*, when by the instrumentality or personal agency of Peter in particular, the foundation of the Christian church was laid among the Jews first, and afterwards among the Gentiles. Nor can the meaning of that address, before the time of the change, be better illustrated than by a comparison with another, which occurred after it. In St. John it is, Thou *art* Simon; Thou *shalt be called* Peter; in St. Matthew it is, Blessed art thou, Simon . . . Thou *art* Peter ^h.

As to the imposition, at the same time, of a name on the two sons of Zebedee; viz. Boanerges; it is not a parallel instance; for being imposed alike on each, it could not be borne as a *personal* denomination by either. We may argue therefore as follows. Simon was not yet an Apostle, when he had not yet received the name of Peter: but he had not yet received the name of Peter until *now*; which is the first quarter of our Lord's second year: he was not yet an Apostle therefore until now. He had been a disciple however for at least a year. And what was true of Peter, as we may take it for granted, was true *a fortiori* of the rest. All the Twelve then had been some time disciples before they became Apostles. We do not, it is true, possess an express account of the call of any but these five,

^g Supra, 284. Dissertation xxiii.

^h Matt. xvi. 17. 18.

Peter and Andrew, James and John, and Matthew : and it is not improbable, as I have observed already elsewhereⁱ, that our Lord himself actually called none but these five. For unless it could be supposed that he would himself call every one who became his disciple, there is no difficulty in conceiving that some, who were subsequently appointed Apostles, might nevertheless originally have voluntarily become disciples; as well as that a vast number of others must of their own accord have become disciples, who yet never were appointed Apostles. Yet St. Peter's description of the qualifications, necessary to constitute a successor in the apostleship to the vacant place of Judas, referred to under a former head^k; as it is self-evident, would be most properly applicable to those who had become, and continued to be disciples from the first.

How long after the original call, the ordination of these five, and of the rest, might take place, it is not possible absolutely to determine; but the period to which I have assigned it (assuming only that the consecration of the four *chief* of the Apostles, at least, fell out about the same time in this year, as their original call in the year before) agrees as well to the course of events before and after the ordination, as any; and it derives this further support from the final end of the appointment itself, that it supposes the ordination of the Twelve—which must have taken place at some determinate time or other—to have happened at that time in general when the Divine Providence, in the maturity of its own counsels, designed that they should enter upon their apostolical office itself; viz. at the time of the feast of Pentecost.

From this period that Peter assumes a kind of pre-

ⁱ Supra, 398. Dissertation xxv.

^k Vol. i. 355. Dissertation x.

eminence among the Twelve, as the Twelve assume among the disciples, and next to Peter, Andrew, James and John ; is supported by too many facts to be disputed. We may infer, then, that the order in which the apostles were called to our Lord and consecrated ; an order, which must have been determined by his own discretion ; was deliberately intended, and was accordingly understood to determine the order of precedence among them. Jesus called to him, from among the disciples, such as he would ; and those whom he called, he made his apostles. As by calling them all in general out of the disciples in general, and by appointing them to a peculiar office and relation, he made them all so far distinct from the disciples as such ; so by calling them one by one in particular, and consecrating them one by one in particular, and consequently some of them before the rest ; he seems to have conferred on some of them an honorary rank and precedence, above the rest : for in the community of name and office, and of personal relation to himself, it is manifest that there was no difference among them ; that they were, and they must have been all equal. One thing is certain ; viz. that in each of the catalogues the name of Peter stands first, and the name of Judas Iscariot last ; the one, confessedly the chief, the other, confessedly the least deserving among the whole body. The intermediate names are somewhat differently arranged in the different lists ; but there is no variation between them which does not admit of being explained.

If we take the order of St. Matthew's catalogue, x. 2-4, and compare with it St. Mark's, iii. 16-19, and St. Luke's, vi. 14-16, or Acts i. 13, they will stand in juxtaposition as follows :

Matt.	Mark.	Luke.	Acts.
1 Simon	1 ———	1 ———	1 Peter
2 Andrew	4 ———	2 ———	4 ———
3 James	2 ———	3 ———	2 ———
4 John	3 ———	4 ———	3 ———
5 Philip	5 ———	5 ———	5 ———
6 Bartholomew	6 ———	6 ———	7 ———
7 Thomas	8 ———	8 ———	6 ———
8 Matthew	7 ———	7 ———	8 ———
9 James Ἀλφαίου	9 ———	9 ———	9 ———
10 Lebbaeus, or Thaddæus	10 Thaddæus	11 Judas Ἰακώ- βου	11 Judas Ἰακώ- βου
11 Simon ὁ Κα- νανίτης	11 ———	10 Simon ὁ Ζη- λωτῆς	10 Simon ὁ Ζη- λωτῆς
12 Judas ὁ Ἰσκα- ριώτης.	12 ———	12 ———	12 Matthias.

We perceive then that in St. Mark's catalogue Andrew is put after James and John; in St. Matthew's and in St. Luke's (as contained in the Gospel) he is put before them. But the order of St. Luke in the Acts agrees with that of St. Mark; whence we may infer that the order of the apostles originally; (that is, in our Saviour's lifetime upon earth;) according to which Andrew might take precedence of James and John, was altered after the Ascension, and when they were all to enter on their own ministry; and that St. Mark has given the order of the names not as it was at first, but as it was ultimately designed to be, and as it afterwards became. Or, what is equally probable, since none of the Evangelists *affirms* his order; if we except the two extreme names of all, it was indifferent in what order the intermediate names were recited. The four apostles, who were either the first called as disciples, or with the exception of Matthew, the only persons who were so called among the apostles, stand, in every instance, at the head of the list; and the subsequent

history of the church, both in the Acts and in the Epistles, proves that these in particular, either all, or three of them, Peter, James, and John, were eminently *pillars* of the church.

Some stress has been laid on the circumstance that two of the Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Luke, record the names in couplets; as if Jesus had called the disciples to him two and two together; or at least, as though he sent them out afterwards, when they were sent two and two together, in the couplets in question. This conjecture is not improbable: for Peter and Andrew, James and John, it is exceedingly likely would be so ordained, and so despatched upon *their* commission in particular, whether any of the rest were so or not. But St. Mark observes no such method; and St. Luke only in part: whence we may conclude that the circumstance in question was accidental; or was not at least intentionally specified with a view to any such construction of it.

The wisdom or expediency of suffering the Twelve to become at first, and for some time after to continue merely disciples, in order to the trial of their faith in, and their attachment to Christ, if not to their personal conviction; before they were elevated to the rank of apostles, must be obvious. Our Lord's knowledge of the human heart is, *a priori*, a sufficient voucher that, in making choice of these, he was selecting those who in point of every moral requisite were the fittest to be chosen for a new and peculiar relation to himself, and for the instruments by which, in the course of time, he designed to work in the propagation of his gospel. As to natural or acquired abilities; without the Divine assistance the greatest must have been as inadequate to the end in view, as the least. Their subsequent history confirms the presumption. The only excep-

tion would seem to be in the original admission, and the ultimate apostasy of Judas. But this was unquestionably necessary, and therefore as naturally intended for the fulfilment of prophecy. If it was requisite that Jesus should be betrayed at last by one of his own apostles; it was also requisite that one of his own apostles should be, from the first, capable of becoming a traitor.

In the number of the Twelve, there is an evident reference to the number of the Tribes; and one apostle seems to have been chosen for every Tribe, because as the event demonstrated, both in the first publication of Christianity, and ever after, they were in a peculiar manner the Apostles of the Circumcision, and sent, like their Master, to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. An extra, and consequently a thirteenth apostle; and though from among the Jews, yet from among the Jews of the Dispersion; was appointed in the fulness of time and in the person of Saul, for the sake of the mission to the Gentiles. This adaptation of the number of the Apostles to the number of the Tribes is peculiarly exemplified in those words of our Saviour¹; Verily I say unto you that, when the Son of Man, in the regeneration, shall sit upon *his* throne of glory, *ye* also who have followed me shall sit upon *twelve* thrones, judging the *twelve* tribes of Israel. The number twelve then seems to have been something, from the first, absolutely essential to the integrity of the apostolic body; and so understood accordingly. Hence, even before the day of Pentecost, or rather, *against* that day itself; the reparation of the defect in that number produced by the apostasy of Judas, when Matthias was appointed in his stead^m, was yet but a necessary precaution.

¹ Matt. xix. 28.

^m Acts i. 15—26.

The selection, nomination, and ordination of the apostles being expressly attributed to our Lord himself, whatever honour or privilege, present or to come, was thereby conferred on the Twelve; it was an honour and a privilege, in obtaining which they themselves were totally uninstrumental. The object proposed by their appointment St. Mark defines as two-fold; that they might always be with Christ, and that he might send them to preach in his name: whence it must be as clear that they had not hitherto always been with him, as that they had not hitherto been sent to preach in his name. It is clear also that this definition is intended of the immediate, or proximate end of their appointment; not of the future and the more remote. But even the mission in question did not take place until some time after the appointment; and it is manifest that the gift of miraculous power, also alluded to, was no gift bestowed at present, but merely designed to be bestowed, when the mission, for the discharge of which it would be necessary, was ready to commence. In the circumstance however of such a mission, and in the communication of thus much of miraculous power subordinate to it, the Seventy were afterwards put upon a par with the Twelve. The true dignity, therefore, the real authority, or the exclusive prerogatives of the apostolical office and character do not fully appear until the day of Pentecost. Their peculiar privilege, during the remainder of our Saviour's ministry, consisted in this one circumstance; that henceforward they were always with him and about him; as even *they* had not always been heretofore; and as the rest of the disciples never were.

If we consider the momentous consequences which, though still in futurity, depended upon this appointment of the Twelve; and though still in futurity, yet to

the omniscience of Christ were even then as good as present: we shall confess that, next to the great business of suffering for mankind, this was, and would be regarded by our Lord himself, as the most important act of his lifetime upon earth. Nor does he enter on it without a corresponding degree of preparation; nor proceed in it without an equal gravity and solemnity. The night before he spends on the mountain apart, in earnest prayerⁿ; as soon as it is day, he calls to him the whole of his disciples^o; out of this number he selects twelve by name, whom he invests with a new, and a peculiar designation, expressive of the same relation to himself, in which he was appearing and acting with reference to the Father. For Jesus Christ was the Shiloh or Apostle of the Father; and the Twelve were the Shilohs or Apostles of Jesus Christ. To this relation and this title it is probable that he consecrated them—either one by one or two by two—with prayer and the imposition of hands: for by prayer and the imposition of hands did the apostles, now consecrated to their office; (and, as we may presume, in imitation of what had been done unto themselves;) consecrate others to any Christian function hereafter: and as Jesus was parted from them at last, while in the act of lifting up his hands over them and of blessing them^p; so with the same affectionate solemnity may he be supposed to have ordained them at first. After this, he delivers a sermon, which is a repetition in part of the former on the mount: Matt. v—viii. 1. But as this brings us to the controverted question itself, whether these sermons were actually the same or distinct, it is now time that we should enter particularly upon it.

We may take it for granted that these two dis-

ⁿ Luke vi. 12.

^o Luke vi. 13. Mark iii. 13, 14.

^p Luke xxiv. 50, 51.

courses, related, as they are, by two distinct Evangelists and in two distinct places of the Gospel history, are either, so far as they go together, totally the same or totally different: for as to their being partly the one and partly the other, (though such an opinion may have been entertained,) it appears to me too absurd a supposition seriously to be refuted. Now if each of them is distinct from the other, then each may be given in its proper time and place. But if they are to be pronounced the same, the question of a transposition concerns the order of St. Matthew, and not that of St. Luke. No commentator or harmonist can reasonably suppose that the latter records *his* sermon out of its place; however many may have thought that St. Matthew has not recorded *his* in its own. By the proof therefore of the distinctness of the discourses; if that can be made out; it must be understood that we are establishing the regularity of St. Matthew, and not of St. Luke.

I. With a view to this conclusion, and as a kind of presumption in its favour, the order of St. Matthew, we may observe, is regular as far as v. 1. The first transposition which occurs, independent of the sermon itself, occurs at viii. 14 ^a.

II. Those who contend that he has antedated the sermon in question, are obliged to detach the introductory remark, at v. 1, as premised to the sermon, from the historical circumstances at iv. 24, 25; the close of the preceding chapter: by doing which, for the sake of an harsh and improbable hypothesis they offer violence to the most simple and natural explanation of the course of events, imaginable. *That* conclusion represents our Lord as followed, or surrounded by prodigious multitudes; *this* introduction, that seeing the

^a Vol. i. 198, 199. Dissertation iii.

multitudes, observing their numbers, and desiring to teach them, he went up into a mountain accordingly. Who, on perusing these statements, would hesitate to infer whether the discourse, which follows, was produced by the circumstances which preceded, or not?

III. I have shewn long since that, before this discourse on the mountain, Jesus had both begun and been making his first general circuit of Galilee. I have ventured also to define the *course* of this circuit^r; shewing in what manner, even from the very route which it appears to have taken, it might make him known in the regions specified by St. Matthew as furnishing the attendance in question. At the close also of the circuit about the lake, and at the time of the ordination of the Twelve, he was certainly accompanied by multitudes^s; but it was not exactly by multitudes from the same quarters as before. For among *these* multitudes people from Idumæa are mentioned by St. Mark; but among *those*, none such are mentioned by St. Matthew: and it must be self-evident that a circuit towards the south of Galilee, and along that side of the Jordan, was more likely to make our Lord known in Idumæa, and to attract people after him from thence, than a circuit towards the north, and along the other half of the river.

IV. The circuits, which our Lord undertook, all began from, and if we except only the last, all ended at Capernaum. After making then for any length of time soever previously the progress of Galilee, he would still be returning to Capernaum at last. It is reasonable to presume that the concourse of his followers would become greater, the longer his journeyings had continued; and would commonly be the greatest when he was nearest to his journey's end. But when do we find

^r Supra, 293, 294. Dissertation xxiii.

^s Mark iii. 7, 8. Luke vi. 17.

him attended by a more than usual resort of people, especially in the early periods of his ministry, and not, at the same time, described as desirous of teaching them? The discourse in St. Matthew, whensoever and wheresoever it was delivered, was delivered on a certain hill; and some hill, as even St. Luke shews, there was in the vicinity of Capernaum. It might have been delivered then at the close of the first circuit of Galilee, from this very hill.

V. The discourse unquestionably contains an illustrious instance of our Lord's teaching; and it is not the less remarkable that, however illustrious, it is a single and a solitary instance of any thing of the kind to be met with in St. Matthew's Gospel. Numerous are the occasions, even after this, when it is affirmed that our Saviour taught; but on no occasion except this is it recorded what he taught. There is but one exception (the instance of the teaching in parables) which can be produced to the contrary; and that is an exception which rather confirms, than invalidates, the assertion. On other occasions, the account of our Lord's discourses, even as recorded by St. Matthew, cannot upon any principle be said to be accounts of his *teaching* as such; or of such moral and practical discourses as this upon the mount. Compare with it the Apostolical commission; the denunciation of woes; and the prophecy on Mount Olivet^t: which are the longest and fullest in the narration of all but this; and it will be acknowledged that they are *sui generis* in contradistinction to this. I infer then that it did not come within the design of St. Matthew's Gospel, to specify the particulars of our Lord's public teaching more than once; that is, more than once *for all*: in which case it is morally absurd to suppose that he

^t Matt. x. xxiii. xxiv. xxv.

would select any but the first opportunity for the purpose; and equally so, to suppose that this first opportunity would not occur before the second year of our Saviour's ministry.

VI. The occurrence of the remark on the manner of our Lord's teaching, at the end of the whole ^u, makes in favour of the same conclusion: for this is a remark, which in each Gospel occurs only once for all, but in each, after the first instance of teaching, which they record. Our Lord's teaching was begun in the synagogue at Capernaum; and when he was engaged on this present circuit, he still taught we are told in the synagogues of Galilee. If so he still taught up to this time within a limited sphere, as well as a corresponding audience; but now he teaches in the open air, and that an innumerable congregation. It is by no means certain whether this was not the very first instance of any such teaching, which had yet occurred: and if that was the case, it would render it on all accounts one of the most memorable incidents of its kind, and one of the most deserving to be placed on record.

VII. The brevity of the historical, compared with the fulness of the discursive matter in St. Matthew is a clear proof that he was more anxious to relate our Lord's conversations than his actions: and in this preference, he has shewn only a due regard to the more useful, and so far the more important part of his narrative. The miracles of our Saviour were designed for unbelievers; his sermons for believers: the latter might be wanted, and continue to be profitable when the former had produced their effect; for miracles could properly convince only their sensible witnesses; discourses may instruct and edify at all times: the benefit of the former then would be partial and temporary; but

^u Matt. vii. 28, 29.

the advantage of the latter is universal and perpetual. Now the compendious manner, in which St. Matthew dispatches the detail of events, from the beginning of the ministry of Christ to the circuit of Galilee; and from that circuit to the sermon on the mount; contrasted with the copious and minute account which he has given of the sermon in particular: must be an internal evidence that the history of the sermon was what he chiefly had in view. He expedites every thing else in order to arrive the sooner at this: but he arrives the sooner at it not by antedating *this*, but by postponing *other* things: and when he is arrived at it, he dwells and dilates upon it with an enlarged and comprehensive particularity, singularly opposed to the brief outline, the succinct and cursory notice premised of every thing which preceded.

VIII. The historical circumstances, which preceded or followed the two sermons, are of such a kind as to be decisive of their distinctness. Let us compare them together.

St. Matthew's sermon took place during, if not at the close of a general circuit of Galilee; St. Luke's, during, if not at the close of a partial circuit round the lake: St. Matthew's, before such an audience as might be collected by such a circuit; St. Luke's, before such a congregation as was more probably to be collected by the other. St. Matthew's was produced by the presence and contemplation of the multitudes; St. Luke's, by the presence and contemplation of the newly-ordained apostles. The moving cause in the former instance was a simple regard to the spiritual necessities of the people at *any* time; the moving cause in the latter was a special regard to the event of the recent ordination. St. Matthew, who suppresses the fact of the previous ordination, could have no inducement to record the sub-

sequent sermon ; but St. Luke, who relates the former, for that reason only might naturally subjoin the latter : the disciples might be primarily addressed by both ; but the multitudes, as well as the disciples, were addressed by the one ; the disciples alone, and not the multitude by the other.

St. Matthew's discourse was delivered on the mountain ; St. Luke's was delivered on the plain : Jesus went up to the mountain, before the one ; he came down from the mountain, before the other : he was on the plain then before St. Luke's ; and he was on the mountain before St. Matthew's. The use of the article, in speaking of this mountain, is natural and correct. There was certainly an hill in the vicinity of Capernaum, from which two such discourses might be pronounced ; and this being both a single hill in itself, and the scene of a double, memorable event, the use of the article, in alluding to it, would be not merely justifiable but necessary. On the same principle, other mountains, which had been the localities of remarkable transactions ; as the mountain where our Saviour twice fed the people ; the mountain on which he was transfigured ; the mountain on which he appeared after the resurrection ; are similarly alluded to as τὸ ὄρος : the well-known, memorable scene of such and such events.

The attempt to reconcile these different statements by supposing that Jesus came down from the mountain to the plain ground at first, on purpose to heal the people and perform his miracles ; and afterwards retired up to the hill again, on purpose to teach them and to deliver his sermon ; like many other expedients invented to explain away similar differences, is altogether a gratuitous assumption, without a shadow of countenance from the text : and besides, it makes our Saviour do that at last, which, as it is clear, he had no

intention of doing at first ; viz. retire from the people, as if he wished to avoid them, whom he came down from the hill on purpose to get near to. In St. Matthew's account, he continued all the while on the mountain ; and, when he had done speaking, he descended, followed by the people, to the plain : in St. Luke's, he continued where he was, on the level ground ; and when the sermon was over, it was from thence that he went to Capernaum. In St. Matthew, he assumes the attitude of sitting before he begins to speak ; which was as good as to intimate that he was about to begin to teach : in St. Luke he delivers his discourse standing ; with his disciples and the people around him. Both attitudes were equally natural under the previous circumstances of the case ; standing, on a level situation ; sitting, upon a rising ground. In St. Matthew, he takes his seat *first*, and the disciples draw near to him *afterwards* ; in St. Luke, he has them about him from the first : in the latter, it would seem as if the disciples and the people stood upon higher ground ; for Jesus, when he began to address them, *lifted up* his eyes to them ; in the former, they must have stood upon lower.

IX. The circumstances, which followed upon the sermon in either account, have been considered elsewhere^v, and their differences pointed out. All the above conclusions however will be further confirmed by the comparison of the discourses themselves.

The sermon in St. Matthew contains one hundred and seven verses ; the sermon in St. Luke, thirty. There is consequently an excess on the one hand, and a defect on the other, of seventy-seven verses ; that is, of more than two-thirds of the whole. It would be difficult however to assign a reason why one of the Evan-

gelists should recite so much, and the other so little of the same discourse ; or why a part should be omitted or recorded, and not the whole. Nor can it be replied that St. Luke has comprised, in thirty verses, the substance of one hundred and seven ; or that *his* sermon is the epitome of St. Matthew's : for on this principle, the outline in both the discourses ought to be the same ; the particulars only should differ. But the state of the case is quite the reverse : the topics in St. Matthew are many, and various, and distinct ; the topics in St. Luke are few, and simple, and closely connected. The discourse in the latter touches only here and there on the former ; but wherever it does so, instead of exhibiting the compressed and meagre features of an epitome, it dwells and dilates upon the subject under discussion with a richness, an emphasis, and an amplification both of sentiments and of language, superior to the fulness of the supposed original ; and preventing the discourse, with such a peculiarity of structure, from being confounded even with the idea of a *selection* out of St. Matthew's ; much less with an *abstract* of it. For the same redundancy stands in the way of the former hypothesis, as much as of the latter.

It is a rule of St. Luke's ; proving both the perfect knowledge of his subject which he possessed, and the consummate skill with which the course of his narrative was shaped from the first ; to relate nothing twice in his own Gospel ; however much may occur there *once* which, taken in conjunction with St. Matthew or St. Mark, his own Gospel may shew to be related *twice*. Such things happened more than once ; and his rule of proceeding with respect to them is as follows : if they had been related, in the first instance of their occurrence, by his predecessors, he reserves his own account of them for the second ; if they would have come twice

over in his own account, he either relates them *once* for all at first, or if he omits any part of them then, he supplies the omission by relating it again at some other opportunity. On this principle, the rest of the discourse in St. Matthew, over and above his own, if both the discourses were one and the same, ought to be found somewhere else in his Gospel. But this is not the case. Twenty or thirty verses of it may perhaps occur there; but more than forty, that is almost one half of the whole, would still remain unaccounted for.

The apparent identity of the exordiums and the conclusions of the two sermons, respectively, is said to have mainly determined the judgment of Grotius in considering them the same. Let us see however how far the nature of these exordiums in particular ought to lead to such an inference.

Both the discourses begin with beatitudes consecutively delivered; of which St. Matthew's exhibits nine, and St. Luke's four. Now nine cannot possibly be the same with four: and if it can be shewn that St. Luke records only four beatitudes, because only four were actually pronounced, it will follow that the occasion, upon which he records these four, must be totally different from that, upon which St. Matthew recorded the nine.

Now besides recording certain beatitudes St. Luke has recorded also certain woes; but St. Matthew no such thing: and as woes in general are the reverse of beatitudes in general, so these woes in particular are the reverse of those beatitudes in particular. The structure of St. Luke's exordium is singular, and a genuine specimen of Hebrew parallelism. He recounts four beatitudes and he recounts four woes; he recounts the beatitudes first and the woes next: the order of the beatitudes is the counterpart of the order of

the woes, and the particular subject of each beatitude is the ἀντίστοιχον of the opposite woe. I argue then that the number and order of the woes, which follow, are decisive as to the number and order of the beatitudes, which precede: each of them is a check upon the other, and a limitation of the other. There could be only four beatitudes; because there are but four woes: there could be only four woes, because there were only four beatitudes.

Besides this, is it no symptom of disparity, that the beatitudes in St. Matthew, as far as the ninth, are all indirect, or couched in the form of general *gnomæ*; in St. Luke they are all direct, and immediately addressed to the disciples? This circumstance alone is sufficient to decide the question; for the very change of manner in the ninth beatitude is a proof that the discourse in St. Matthew had begun, and until then had proceeded differently. Were this also a proper place to explain either of the sermons particularly, it might be shewn, on the ground of the woe specifically opposed to each beatitude, that the terms πτωχοὶ, πεινῶντες, κλαίοντες, in the three first beatitudes of St. Luke, must be literally understood, of the really poor, the really hungry, the really mournful and disconsolate in this life: whereas, it is equally clear that the same terms in St. Matthew are to be figuratively understood, of the poor in spirit, of the hungry and thirsty after righteousness, of the sorrow produced by repentance and the sense of sin. These objections would remain, though the beatitudes and the other particulars of each exordium, so far as they agreed together, were all related alike. It happens however that, neither with their order nor with their enunciation, is this the case. St. Luke's fourth beatitude is St. Matthew's ninth; and what is still more extraordinary, his second and his third are just the

reverse in St. Matthew ; that is, what answers to his second comes after what answers to his third : and as to the language and expressions, they are different in every instance throughout.

A comparison of the conclusions, and of the intermediate parts, would tend to the same result. But as it would require the examination of verse by verse, and not merely of paragraph by paragraph, and as the effect would be still the same, in the eviction of discrepancies after discrepancies, affecting not simply omissions, or what is wanting in one Gospel though supplied by the other, but the arrangement and expression of what is found to be related in common by both ; I may be excused from entering upon it.

The sermon in St. Luke exhibits all the evidences of an original discourse, and of an uniform composition. Its topics are determinate, consistent, and natural ; mutually connected together ; and applicable to the case of the newly-ordained Apostles, as enforcing duties either eminently Christian in themselves, or in their primary relation peculiarly incumbent upon them. But there is no such leading idea, no such exclusive reference predominant in St. Matthew's : one purpose of which (though only to a certain extent, and for a limited portion of the whole) is to reinforce parts of the Decalogue ; and therefore to characterise the Preacher more as that original and independent Lawgiver, promised by Moses^w and expected by the Jews, than as the Master and Instructor of the Apostles. The tone and manner of the first sermon ; the general sentiment, the spirit and character of the former ; may indeed be discovered in the second. Both the discourses are manifestly the offspring of the same mind, and there is a family likeness between them. But as even in the

^w Deut. xviii. 15—19.

children of the same parents, or in members of the same family in common, the individuating characters of each are not so indistinct or imperceptible as to allow of our confounding them together. I have judged it best therefore to disturb the position of neither; but to leave each where it stands upon record. It is an additional reason for coming to this determination, that though the business of teaching the people must have been our Saviour's regular employment, if any thing was so; yet in all the Gospels together these two are the only occasions upon which we have the least account in detail of what he taught: and to confound these two discourses, or to suppose the occasions which produced them identical, is manifestly little to be desired.

DISSERTATION XXVII.

On the beginning to teach in Parables, and on the time and place of their interpretation.

UPON the particular exposition of the parables which were now delivered, it would manifestly be improper to enter in the present work; nor shall I notice the subject of the Gospel narrative in this portion of the whole, further than concerns the business of an Harmony; in the consideration of a certain historical difficulty: with respect to which there exists some degree of perplexity, and which, to say the least of that degree of perplexity, no Harmony ought to pass over (though most of those with which I am acquainted have nevertheless passed it over) unexplained.

With regard to the time or the manner of this beginning to teach in parables, as well as to the order of succession in which these first of the number were pronounced, there is little or no difficulty. On each of these points the testimony of the several Evangelists is either obviously consistent, or easily to be reconciled together. Thus much however is distinctly implied by the express words of St. Matthew and St. Mark, and not called in question merely by the silence of St. Luke; that our Lord began to teach in parables for the *first* time upon this occasion; and consequently that he had never delivered a parable before: a conclusion, which the course and succession of the Gospel-history hitherto must of itself confirm. There is no parable, nor any vestige of a parable, like those which were now pronounced, and those which are seen to be pronounced hereafter, to be met with in it. The word,

παραβολή, it is true, may occur; but wherever this is the case, it stands for a very different thing from what we consider to be meant by a *parable*: as if I thought it necessary, I could very plainly demonstrate.

It is agreed also that when our Lord began thus to teach in parables, it was upon the shore of the lake of Capernaum, to which he had repaired on purpose; and sitting on board a small vessel, at some distance indeed from the land, but not so far as to be out of the hearing of the people. This, as we have often seen, was his familiar practice when in the vicinity of the lake; or when he would avoid the pressure of the multitude. And hence perhaps it is that, speaking of the ship in question, both the Evangelists make use of the article; meaning probably the very ship which had been appointed^a to attend upon him, and to be ready for such services as these, when he was last in the neighbourhood of the lake.

The difficulty, to which I allude, concerns the time and manner of delivering those interpretations of two of the present parables—the seed and the tares—which Jesus is perceived to have vouchsafed at the request of his disciples. It must be evident from Matt. xiii. 36, that the interpretation of the latter could neither have been asked, nor have been conceded, before the dismissal of the multitude and the return of our Lord to Capernaum. This interpretation, therefore, as well as the request which produced it, must have been posterior to the day's teaching in public; that is, strictly a part of what afterwards took place in private. But the interpretation of the former parable St. Matthew himself interposes before he recounts the second; and the other two Evangelists, whether they record any more parables than the first, or not, yet subjoin the explanation

^a Mark iii. 9.

of the first before they proceed to the next. This interpretation too was produced by a request of the disciples; yet the fact of such a request does not appear from St. Matthew: it is supplied by St. Mark and St. Luke alone.

The question, then, which we have to consider, amounts substantially to this; Whether the request, which produced the exposition of the parable of the sower, was preferred and answered on the spot; or like that which produced the interpretation of the parable of the tares, was preferred and answered after our Lord had returned into private. And here, as we have frequently had occasion to observe, the testimony of the less explicit, the less circumstantial, the less positive among the Evangelists, it is just and reasonable, should be estimated altogether in conformity to the testimony of the more so.

Now at the close of St. Mark's account of this day's teaching, we meet with the following observation^b, which does not occur in either of the other two: And in many such parables did he speak the word unto them; so as they were able to hear him: but without a parable did he not speak unto them: in private however he expounded every thing to his own disciples. This statement must be understood to affirm that, for that day and while he was still in public, Jesus spake in nothing but parables; taking care only that what he himself was pronouncing aloud, from the ship and the sea, might be heard by the people on the shore: but that, when the day's teaching was over, and the people had been dismissed, he explained to his disciples what he had been teaching.

There is nothing, it is true, said about the disciples requesting this explanation; but neither is any thing

^b Ch. iv. 33, 34.

said to the contrary: and with regard to the *fact* of any explanation, the mention of this further circumstance was clearly unimportant. There was one parable also, the last on record, which he did certainly interpret of his own accord; and upon the authority of this assurance of St. Mark's, whether the interpretations of more were requested or not, we should be bound to believe that they were given. The great point of distinction, which the Evangelist would impress upon us, is the marked difference of our Saviour's conduct in respect to the same thing, the understanding of his parables, towards the people in general and his disciples in particular. He explained to the one what he had disguised from the other; that is, he conceded a special favour and indulgence to the one, but denied them to the other. Now the parables had been pronounced, at first, in the hearing of the disciples as well as of the multitude; and they had been as unintelligible, at first, to the former as to the latter. He could not then explain them even to the disciples, except in private: for as to rendering *κατ' ἰδίαν*, *aside*, or *apart*, in any sense distinct from *in private*; that is, as to supposing that every parable was explained on the spot to the disciples, after and as it had been just pronounced to the people, such a supposition would be little better than absurd. According therefore to St. Mark, no interpretation of any of the parables could have been delivered, except in private; and out of the three such explanations, which are on record, two, as it is obvious, were delivered in private.

But again; before he subjoins the interpretation of the parable of the sower, St. Mark premises the following words, in allusion to the circumstances under which it was granted: ^c ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο καταμόνας, ἠρώτησαν

αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν, σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, τὴν παραβολήν. The received translation renders the first part of this sentence, And when he was alone; its full meaning, however, is, But when he was *become* alone—when he was *got* by himself. Now what could be understood by these words, except his returning into private? Before, he was in the company of the multitude; and therefore was not by himself: or if it should be objected that he was in the ship, and the people on the shore, I would ask, if that is what is meant by his being alone, how was it possible to become more alone? Besides, if the rest of the disciples, along with the Twelve, put this request and put it in public, they must have put the request along with the Twelve, and put it in public, on board the ship; and therefore have all been with Jesus, as well as the Twelve, in the ship. But though this might be the case with the Twelve, it is not probable that it would be so with more. The vessels, which navigated the lake of Tiberias, were certainly capable of holding more than a complement of twelve persons. But, if we consider for what purpose our Lord had taken up his position on the ship; viz. not to interfere with the business of his teaching, but to avoid the proximity of the crowd; it is not likely that he would admit thither more than his constant attendants, which were merely the Twelve.

The same conclusion is further confirmed by the first words of our Lord's answer to the request itself^d: To you it is conceded to know the μυστήριον—that is, the secret—of the kingdom of God: ἐκείνοις δὲ, τοῖς ἔξω—they are all conveyed in parables. Here as the disciples are clearly denoted by the *you*, so the multitudes, opposed to them, are as clearly to be understood by the ἐκείνοις, τοῖς ἔξω. Now these words also would be in-

^d Mark iv. 11.

adequately rendered, To those without. The mere use of ἐκείνοις δὲ, that is, But unto them—would have been enough to distinguish the people in general from the disciples in particular: the addition of τοῖς ἔξω, which defines and limits even the demonstrative pronoun, opposes them so much the more. The words then should be understood to mean, But unto them, those, I say, who are without. It is as if Jesus had begun by saying, Unto you, τοῖς ἔσω, such and such privileges are conceded—but to those others, τοῖς ἔξω, just the reverse.

It is clearly therefore implied that, at the time when this conversation was passing, Jesus and the disciples, οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν, were somewhere *within*, and the rest of the people were somewhere *without*. If so, our Lord and his disciples were in private. For in what sense could the multitude be called οἱ ἔξω, and our Lord's immediate attendants be opposed to them as οἱ ἔσω, if both were alike in the open air, and still in public? Is it a sufficient account of this distinction that the latter were in the ship, and the former were not? or, while all were in common in public, could there possibly be room for such a division between any one part and the rest, as that of οἱ ἔξω and οἱ ἔσω? No such distinction occurs in St. Matthew, or in St. Luke: the former of whom has simply ἐκείνοις, and the latter, τοῖς λοιποῖς.

It must be some confirmation of the same conclusion, that our Lord's disciples, from their habitual respect to their Master, would surely not presume to interrupt him while engaged in the delivery of a series of parables, and as they might perceive, of nothing else. Still less would they do this to gratify their own curiosity. It is possible, that under such circumstances they might ask him *why* he was teaching in parables; that is, in a manner so different from usual; so con-

trary to the plainness and simplicity, which had characterised his doctrine hitherto. The surprise and novelty of the thing itself might lead to thus much; especially if a pause in the continuity of his discourse supplied the opportunity of putting the question: but they would not account for more.

Besides, if our Lord explained any of his parables in public as he first delivered them, this would have endangered the very end of teaching in parables at all. For if the explanation, as well as the parable which it explained, was delivered in public, what was there to prevent the people, who had heard the parable, from hearing also the explanation? It is some argument too, that the interpretation of the first parable is said to have been begun by οὐκ οἶδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνῶσεσθε^e; We cannot suppose that the reference here is intended of any parables, but those which were actually now delivered; five of which are placed on record, and more than five perhaps were spoken. If the words then are to be rendered thus, Have ye not understood this parable? how then will ye understand them all? they will imply that all had been delivered already, and all had been understood or not understood already; but that this being the simplest, and easiest, and consequently the most likely to be comprehended of any, if this had been mistaken, it would be much more difficult to make them comprehend the rest.

What then shall we say to St. Matthew's testimony, who has certainly interposed the interpretation between the parable to which it refers, and the parable of the tares, which follows next; and as it would seem in answer to a question from the disciples?

I. He does not say the disciples put any request, as

^e Mark iv. 13.

soon as Jesus had done speaking the parable. He uses his ordinary form of expression ; implying that, except when our Lord's followers, even the Apostles, had occasion to prefer some inquiry, or otherwise to come to him of their own accord, they were accustomed to keep at a certain distance from him^f ; The disciples *came* to him and said : an assertion which would be equally true of what might be done afterwards, as much as of what might be done then.

II. The inquiry, which he shews that they actually put, is not, as in the other two Evangelists, the question, What might this parable be ? but the question, Why art thou speaking to them, that is, to the people, in parables ? a question, not only very different from the other, but under the circumstances of the case much more likely to be put. If our Saviour hitherto had never taught in parables ; so that a parable, until now, was an unheard-of thing : if he began now, and continued to teach in nothing else ; more especially if the kind of parables, which he first employed, was the allegorical ; a kind, in its own nature designed for mystery and concealment : nothing could be more reasonable than that the disciples should be surprised and perplexed by this sudden change in the manner of his public address : nor than that, under the influence of these feelings, as soon as a pause in his discourse occurred (which was manifestly the case at xiii. 9) they should inquire into the causes of the change.

It is not likely, however, that both the questions on record would be put in conjunction ; or though they were so, still it would be morally certain that St. Matthew's would be first put and first answered. It is certain also, that St. Matthew mentions only one of them, St. Mark and St. Luke mention only the other : but if

^f Ch. xiii. 10.

both were put at once, no good reason can be assigned for the omission in either case. If however two different questions were really put and really answered, each at a different time and place, then such an omission is conceivable.

It is certain likewise, that the answer to St. Matthew's question, as recorded by him^g, however obliquely it may be given, is yet a proper answer to the previous inquiry; because the very words of the inquiry are repeated in verse 13, and the rest, before and after this verse, is so connected with it, as to be necessarily the substance of one and the same reply. It is evident also that the answer to St. Mark's question^h is all a proper answer to that one and the same inquiry, which is again alluded to at verse 13. Notwithstanding too the apparent substantive resemblance of verses 11, 12 in St. Mark (agreeing almost *verbatim* with verse 10 in the parallel passage of Luke) to some parts of St. Matthew's account; still there is so much real difference between them, that we should not know on what principle to regard them as the identical account of an identical discourse, at the same time and place.

To specify no more than one single instance: it is surely a proof of great disparity that, in quoting the words of Isaiah, St. Matthew describes our Lord to say, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι: and St. Mark, ἵνα βλέποντες...μὴ ἴδωσι. The former is the natural mode of assigning the *producing cause*, the latter, the *final end* of the effect in question. According to the one, Jesus is made to reply, and very appositely to the question which precedes; For this reason am I speaking to them in parables, because that seeing they *do not see*: and according to the other, though no longer with any express reference to such a question, yet equally appo-

^g Ch. xiii. 11—17.

^h Ch. iv. 10—25.

sitely under the circumstances of the case ; To those, who are without, they are all made known in parables ; to the intent that seeing they *may not see*.

The harmony then of the several accounts will stand as follows :

I. Matthew xiii. 10–17 is regular ; containing the answer actually returned to the question actually put, at the close of the *first* parable ; Why art thou speaking in parables ?

II. Mark iv. 10–25 and Luke viii. 9–18, assign the similar reply to the similar inquiry, What might that parable be ? but after the day's teaching in public was over. In both, parts of what had been already related by St. Matthew, and in answer to the former question ; concerning the singular privilege, conceded to the disciples, in being favoured by the disclosure of truths, purposely concealed from the rest ; are found to be repeated : but so naturally and so pertinently to the occasion, that their recurrence can be considered no objection. Nor is this account in St. Mark a proper Anticipation ; because he specifies, at the outset, the true time to which it belongs ; and shews thereby that he had nothing in view by it, except to connect the interpretation as closely as possible with what it interpreted—for the mutual advantage of both.

III. Matthew xiii. 18–23, is, consequently, a proper Anticipation, being given without any such intimation ; yet it is an Anticipation, which may be vindicated on the same principle—the principle of subjoining the explanation directly to the parable explained. The intermediate question might be truly put and answered, as it is represented to be ; and if so, it would furnish an opportunity for continuing the discourse of our Lord, once begun upon this subject, to another, not much unlike it. He might have this further in-

ducement also to do this ; that the substance of the answer to the first question was premised though very briefly to the interpretation accorded to the second.

IV. Our Lord's teaching being afterwards resumed in the parable of the tares, it might be uninterruptedly continued through the rest of the parables on record, and perhaps more, until he returned to his private abode in Capernaum ; where, consequently, as it is shewn by St. Matthew himself, the inquiry about the parable of the tares, which led to its explanation, must have been put. To conclude then.

The number of parables, related as now delivered whether in public or in private, is eight : seven of which are found in St. Matthew, three in St. Mark, and one in St. Luke. Of St. Matthew's seven, four are peculiar to his Gospel ; and of St. Mark's three, the second is peculiar to his ; St. Luke's one, as well as its interpretation, is recorded by them all : it is in fact the parable of the sower.

Of these omissions, St. Matthew's may perhaps be accounted for by supposing that many more such parables, as this one which is wanting to complete the eight, might be now delivered ; and consequently that omissions of more or of fewer, among the whole number, might be expected in all the accounts. On this subject I cannot enter at large at present ; or else it might be shewn that these minor parables are related rather as specimens of the class to which they belong, and as instances of the many figurative modes of describing some historical circumstance or other in the future Christian dispensation, upon which this day's teaching, continued as it was through no little time, was probably occupied ; than as a complete enumeration of all which were actually spoken.

St. Mark's omissions are obviously in unison with

his characteristic conciseness in the account of our Lord's discourses; a conciseness the true reason of which has perhaps been alleged elsewhereⁱ.

With regard to St. Luke, two out of the seven which he omits came over again in another part of the Gospel-history, and are recorded by him there^k: three others, which were delivered in private, he might naturally omit because, as neither the beginning nor the ending of this day's teaching is specified by him in particular, he neither brings our Lord out of a certain house to commence his teaching on the lake, nor takes him back thither when it was over. Besides which, it is a general reason for *his* omissions, and also for St. Mark's, that the parables omitted being all of them prophecies, and prophecies which, at the time when they composed their Gospels, had long been more or less fulfilled; to have recorded them as they were first delivered, would be to have related the prediction after its fulfilment by the event. The same objection does not apply to the account of them in St. Matthew; whose Gospel, as we have shewn, was written early in the history of the progress of Christianity, and before it had been preached among the Gentiles^l.

But indeed the general conciseness of St. Luke, in the account of this whole transaction, must satisfy an impartial reader that it was designed; and in all probability was due to his knowledge of the minute and adequate relation, which the same things had experienced from his predecessors; especially from St. Matthew. Hence had not the one parable, which he does record, been the first of its kind, and expressly interpreted by our Lord himself, so as to constitute an epoch in his ministry; a remarkable change in his man-

ⁱ Vol. i. 154. Dissertation ii.
Dissertation ii.

^k Ch. xiii. 18—21.

^l Vol. i. 152.

ner of teaching ; and above all so as to be a specimen both of the method of instruction by parables, and of the mode of understanding and interpreting them : I consider it not improbable that he would have passed over even this.

As to the verbal agreement between the several accounts, it is greater between St. Matthew's and St. Mark's, than between either and St. Luke's : a distinction, which holds good also in other instances ; and for the reasons alluded to before, was *a priori* to be expected. In the account however of the parables, verbal coincidences are perhaps not to be expected, on the same grounds as in the relation of our Lord's other discourses. For every such parable consists of an history, the basis of which is an action ; and hence, though it may be related as something originally conceived and pronounced by our Saviour, it no more requires to be related in the same form of words throughout, than the common facts of his personal history ; which are all given, under different forms of narration, as the same history of what he did or suffered in general.

DISSERTATION XXVIII.

On the question concerning eating with unwashen hands,
Matthew xv. 1—20. Mark vii. 1—23.

IN order to compare these accounts, the most convenient distribution of the narrative is into what took place with the Pharisees and with the multitude in public^a, and what with the disciples in private^b. The difficulty of reconciling them is much greater as concerns the former, than as concerns the latter: and with regard to each there is proof of *one* omission, at least, in St. Matthew, supplied by St. Mark: first, the immediate cause of the question of the Pharisees^c; and secondly, the renewal of the conversation in private after the decision in public, when Jesus and the disciples were come into some house^d: neither of which things is specified, though both may be implied in St. Matthew.

Independent also of this distinction, the account of St. Mark is in other respects the fuller and more particular of the two. Not to mention the substance of vii. 3, 4, containing so minute an explanation of the customs in question of the Jews, which he premises to the ensuing narrative; there is nothing in St. Matthew corresponding to vii. 8. 9, and perhaps to vii. 12. 13, in St. Mark; vii. 16. also is peculiar to the latter. It is true, that xv. 12. 13. 14. may be found only in St. Matthew: but this is an integral part of the account, which might be detached from the rest and omitted, without prejudice either to what goes before, or to

^a Matt. xv. 1—11. Mark vii. 1—16.
17—23.

^c Mark vii. 2.

^b Matt. xv. 12—20. Mark vii.
^d Mark vii. 17.

what follows after it. This omission therefore in St. Mark is not like the omissions in St. Matthew, which were partly the omissions of facts necessary in the way of explanation, and partly the concise representation of what was more fully expressed by the speaker. Had St. Mark, indeed, in what he records along with St. Matthew, been found to abbreviate some things, while he enlarged upon others, instead of being more circumstantial throughout; the argument from the comparative particularity or conciseness of either would be neutral.

With regard to this single omission, which I am persuaded was intentionally made; it is sufficiently accounted for by considering to what it relates. The part in question is a prophetic denunciation, levelled against the Pharisees; whose *persons*, and not whose *doctrines*, are denoted by the figurative language which it employs*. They had taken offence at the recent decision^e; and the disciples, who reported this fact to their Master, apprehended some evil consequences from their resentment. The declaration subjoined was intended to reassure them; and predicts that in due time both they and their followers should come to nothing. *Let them alone*, that is, *leave them to themselves*; and they will run blindly to their own destruction. They were no plantation of the Father's planting; and therefore should at last be rooted out. All this was certainly prophecy; but prophecy with a limited application; and like the longer and more particular denunciations which occur hereafter^f, personally regarded only the Scribes and the Pharisees of that generation, and was

* Ignatius, PP. Apostolici, 865. A. ad Trallianos xi. speaking of heretics, borrows the language of the text: οὗτοι γὰρ οὐκ

^e Matt. xv. 11, 12.

εἰσὶν φυντεία πατρός. κ', τ. λ. So likewise 870. A. ad Philadelphenos iii.

^f Luke xi. 39—52. Matt. xxiii.

to be fulfilled only in their personal history. If however St. Mark wrote for Gentiles, or at least for persons unacquainted with Jewish sects and Jewish usages; (of which the explanation, premised to the account, is a sufficient proof;) it does not appear what particular interest in the fate of a sect or party, among the Jews, these were likely to take: nor consequently why such denunciations, having been already recorded by St. Matthew, might not be purposely omitted by St. Mark. Such seems to be the principle on which he acts every where else: for neither in his account of the ministry of John, nor in that of the ministry of Christ; do any of the penal denunciations with a special and a limited reference, which stand so prominently in St. Matthew, occur in St. Mark. His omission of all the personal matter, in reply to the charge of dispossession by the agency of Beelzebub, and his similar omission of the whole of Matthew xxiii, are examples to the point.

This evidence then of the greater circumstantiality of St. Mark in the present instance must contribute something to reconcile his account to St. Matthew's; but it will not, as in other instances, be all which is necessary for that effect. The existing differences are such as do not admit of being adjusted, simply upon this principle; for they involve a question not so much of omission and supplement, as of order and statement. The first part of our Lord's reply in St. Mark is the last in St. Matthew; and the last in St. Matthew is the first in St. Mark: that is, Mark vii. 6-8, answers to Matt. xv. 7-9; and Matt. xv. 3-6, answers to Mark vii. 9-13: with respect to which I shall, notwithstanding, endeavour to shew, first, that St. Matthew's order may be, and I believe was the true; yet, secondly, that St. Mark's is not at variance with it.

St. Matthew's order, as we may presume, is the true, first, because the reply of our Lord, as recorded by him, is recorded continuously, and as *one* reply ; without interruption from first to last.

Secondly, because the terms of the first sentence of this reply are so clearly accommodated to the terms of the question just before ^g, that no one can doubt whether the former was immediately retorted upon the latter, or not. Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders ? Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God ? There cannot be a more perfect specimen of antithesis. One expostulation is opposed to another ; one set of persons are contrasted with another ; an instance of the breach of one law is met by an instance of the breach of another.

From the conduct of Jesus at last, it is evident that he never intended to answer the question of the Pharisees to *them* ; he meant to reserve his decision for the people. He knew that they had some sinister purpose in preferring the demand ; or at least that to enter upon the question, on its own grounds, before *them* ; to explain to *them* how utterly insignificant in the sight of God were all forms of merely external purity, unaccompanied by the purity of the heart ; would necessarily fail of its effect. His answer therefore is entirely an *argumentum ad homines*. *He* does as good as promise to explain unto *them*, why his own disciples transgressed the tradition of the elders, if *they* would first explain to *him*, why their disciples, in obedience to that tradition, transgressed the commandment of God.

Thirdly because, though the hypocrisy of the interrogators could not but be known to our Lord, and could not but be justly the subject of *his* reproaches,

from the first; yet for the sake of those about him, it might still be necessary openly to expose that hypocrisy, before he reproached them with it: in which case, it was more likely that he would begin as St. Matthew represents him to do, than as St. Mark.

The instance of hypocrisy, with which he accordingly reproaches them, consisted in this case, as in other cases of the like kind, in straining off a gnat, and swallowing a camel; in resenting a small offence, and deliberately sanctioning a greater. There is no comparison, in point of force and obligation, between the laws of God and the laws of men; yet even on their own admission the laws of tradition, being every where spoken of as the traditions of the *elders*, or of *those of old time*, were not the laws of God, but the laws of men. To the existence of this law of tradition among his countrymen Josephus bears distinct testimony^h; and he attributes it also to the Pharisees, whose origin he first mentionsⁱ as contemporary with Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabæus. It is true that the pretended zeal for the law of tradition was grounded, or affected to be grounded, on a zeal for the authority of God: the laws of tradition, as it was maintained by the rabbis, were originally derived from the will or commands of God. But the traditionary word of God—to admit for argument's sake the existence of any such word—could possess at the utmost only an equal, and certainly not a superior authority in comparison of the written: and if in a given instance the doctrines or precepts of the one were diametrically repugnant to the doctrines or precepts of the other, they could not both be derived from the same authority, or both retain the same authority: one of them must needs be false, or must

^h Ant. Jud. xiii. x. 6.

ⁱ Ib. v. 9.

needs succumb to the other. The same legislator could never deliberately contradict himself; nor while a certain injunction still remained in force, exact at one time what he had directly proscribed at another. Much less was it possible for two contrary requisitions both to proceed from God; or, if in a given instance there should be any conflict between two rules of duty, each of them professing to emanate from him, that both could be derived from the same Divine source, or both entitled to equal consideration and obedience in deference to a common authority.

Now whatever authority was ascribed to the oral or traditionary word of God, it was not denied that his written word continued the same. The law of tradition might pretend to explain the law of Moses, but it did not presume to abrogate it, or to say that it was no longer of effect. The written word of God then being always professedly acknowledged as the genuine, authentic record of the will and commands of God; yet the traditionary word being also considered the same; it follows that, on this principle, there were two genuine, authentic records of the will of God, and two authoritative rules of duty, the law of Moses and the tradition of the elders. If these therefore were each of them what they professed to be, they must agree together; or if there was any thing in the one flatly contradictory to something in the other, one of them must be a false pretender to its title: which one might be the law of tradition, but even on the admission of the Pharisees could not be the law of Moses.

The ordinances of bodily ablution, and the other precepts of external purity, in an alleged breach whereof the offence of the disciples consisted, being no where prescribed in the written word of God, rested exclusively on the authority of tradition; and the laws of

tradition being all similarly founded, any instance of a direct contradiction between them and the written word of God would be sufficient to discredit the whole system; and to justify the inference that what led to such consequences as these could never be the dictate of eternal truth and justice, instinctively recognised by the consciences of mankind, but must be a gross and palpable delusion, founded in fraud and cunning, or the fruit of error and infatuation. Many such examples of traditionary rules of duty, at variance with the plainest maxims of moral and religious truth, there might have been produced; but that, which our Lord insists upon in the present instance as among the most criminal of all, and among the most flatly repugnant both to the written word of God, and to the natural sense of right and wrong, was the perversion of the vow of Corban, as sanctioned by the law of tradition.

The existence of the vow of Corban in his own time is recognised by Josephus: καὶ οἱ κορβᾶν αὐτοὺς ὀνομάσαντες τῷ Θεῷ δῶρον δὲ τοῦτο σημαίνει κατὰ Ἑλλήνων γλῶτταν^k.—δηλοῖ δὲ . . δῶρον Θεοῦ^l. By this vow both property and persons might become devoted to God; and what had been once thus appropriated never after could be put to any other use^m. One of the earliest instances of such a Corban was, in my opinion, the devotion of the daughter of Jephthah to perpetual virginityⁿ; which I am persuaded was of no other description: the next was the consecration of Samuel, whom Hannah his mother solemnly dedicated to the Lord even before his conception^o; and whom Eli, in allusion to this dedication, calls by a beautiful metaphor the loan which was lent to the Lord^p; interceding with

^k Ant. Jud. iv. iv. 4.
Deut. xxiii. 21—23.
^p 1b. ii. 20.

^l Contra Apionem, i. 22.
ⁿ Judges xi. 30, 31. 37—39. 40.

^m Lev. xxvii. 28.
^o 1 Sam. i. 11.

God that for the sake of this loan, and as it were in acknowledgment of the use of this loan, he would bless his parents with a numerous family.

But in order to the natural effect of the vow of Corban, it must have been *bona fide* made; and when made, it was to be *bona fide* fulfilled. It could never stand good as the result of ignorance or of inadvertency; much less as a subterfuge to escape from other duties. The law of tradition however had perverted it to these abuses; affixing so superstitious a value to the mere pronunciation of the terms δῶρον ἔστω—that, of whatsoever they might have been said, it became thenceforward restricted from its natural use and purpose, yet not necessarily appropriated to the service of God. Hence if a son, whether in the heat of passion, or coolly and deliberately, had only said to one of his parents—δῶρον ἔστω, ὃ εἰάν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελῇ θῆς—may every thing of mine, which might be useful to thee, be δῶρον; though by such a mode of vowing nothing became consecrated to God, yet every thing was tied up from his parents; he had debarred himself from doing good to them again; he would be as much guilty of impiety, if he turned his means or opportunities ever after to their benefit, as if his goods and possessions, his soul and his body, having all been inalienably appropriated to God, had subsequently been put to any other use: yet strange to say, for any purpose but that one, he was just as much his own master, he was as free to do what he pleased with his own, as before. Thus was a rash and inadvertent, or even a designing and malicious expression rendered perpetually binding on the conscience; the name of religion and the honour of God were prostituted as a cloke for unnatural wickedness; and even the road to repentance was effectually

blocked up: for as our Lord continues^q, a son after that, though he might wish it, would not be permitted to honour his parents; he would be kept to his word, against his own inclination; he would be held as amenable to spiritual or temporal censures, for services rendered to them, as if he had applied a *bona fide* Corban to any profane use. Such monstrous hypocrisy, or such palpable self-delusion, as is implied in this doctrine, is scarcely to be credited of any description of persons who did not find their interest in it; or if the general wickedness of the times had not rendered it, as a means of evading the simplest and plainest duties, only too palatable to the world at large. Yet this explanation of the doctrine is capable of being confirmed by the testimony of the rabbis themselves; and I shall produce the necessary proofs of it by and by.

In the mean while this breach of the fifth commandment, as authorized by the law of tradition, has a case in point, in the breach of the third also; which is just as strongly insisted on, Matthew xxiii. 16–22. All those distinctions tended alike to refine away the sanctity of oaths; and consequently to sap the foundations not merely of a religious veneration for the name and the attributes of God, but of mutual faith and trust among men; of which there can no longer be any safeguard, when oaths, the most deliberate and solemn of the modes of conviction, are no more of any effect. Amidst all such distinctions between *one* oath which was good, and *another* which was nothing, we may trace a common feature of resemblance, which proves, more than any thing, the impurity of their origin; and that they were the contrivances of fraud and cunning, invented for the purpose of deceiving. That mode of swearing,

^q Matt. xv. 5.

which was *a priori* the most natural and probable, is in each instance pronounced good for nothing: and that, which was the most unnatural and the least likely to occur, is in every instance alone made binding. But which of these distinctions would be most serviceable for the sake of deception, nobody can question.

For the proof of the explanation referred to, the reader may consult the authorities in the margin^r. This one passage from Maimonides is sufficient to establish it: *Si quis . . . ita dixisset, Sit mihi Corban ista massa panis, Sit mihi sacra res; atque idem exinde massam istam panis comedisset, hic sane prævaricatione obstringeretur, quamvis eadem massa panis reliquis hominum licita fuisset*^s. Vide however the other cases which he supposes in the same passage. Hence, that maxim of the Talmud, *Votum (scilicet, Corban) etiam in legem cadit—juramentum, non item: Corban might excuse from the obligation of written precepts; an oath, could not: and it must have been some practical knowledge of the perversion of this kind of vow which, according to the testimony of Theophrastus, induced the Tyrians, neighbours of the Jews, to forbid it expressly by law among themselves*^t.

St. Chrysostom's account of it approaches very nearly to the above. They taught, says he^u, the young men, under a cloke of piety, to despise their parents . . . If any parent said to his son, Give me this sheep which thou hast; or this calf; or any other such thing: they used to say, This is Corban for God; with which thou wishest to be obliged by me: and thou canst not re-

^r Pococke, *Notæ Miscellanæ ad Portam Mosis*, cap. ix. Maimonides, *De Jurejurando*, vi. 15. Annot. ^s *De Sacrorum Abusu*, iv. 9. ^t Jos. Contra Apionem, i. 22. ^u *Operum* vii. 521. E—522. A. in *Matthæum* Homilia li. 2.

ceive it. And so it was that a double evil was committed : for neither did they bring it to God, and yet as if they intended to bring it, they deprived their parents of it ; both mocking their parents under pretence of God, and God, under pretence of their parents.

The account of Origen is not equally correct ; and yet he confesses he should never have discovered it, such as it is, if he had not been taught it by a native Jew ^v.

It sometimes happened, says he, that the lenders of money, meeting with unreasonable borrowers, who were able, but not willing to repay them the loan ; dedicated what was due to them to the account of the poor, for whom contributions used to be cast into the treasury, according to his ability, by each of those who were willing to communicate unto them. They said therefore sometimes to the borrowers, according to their own language, It is Corban, that is, a gift ; what thou owest to me ; for I have dedicated it to the account of the worship due to God, viz. unto the poor. Upon that, the borrower as indebted no longer to men but to God, and to the worship due to him, was as it were compelled, even though against his inclination, to repay the loan.....

What then the lender used to do to the borrower some of the children sometimes did to their parents ; and said to them, Whatsoever thou mightest be benefited in by me, father or mother, this know that thou receivest from the Corban ; upon the footing of the poor who are dedicated to God. Upon that, the parents when they heard that it was Corban, dedicated to God,

^v Operum iii. 489. B—490. A. Comm. in Matt. Tomus xi. 9. Cf. Theophylact, i. 78. A—C. where both explanations are mentioned, and Ibid. 206. A. B. in Marcum, vii.

which they were giving to them, were no longer willing to receive it from their children, though they might be altogether in want of necessaries. The elders, therefore, delivered such a tradition to the laity—that, whosoever should say to his father, or his mother, that what is given to any of them is Corban, and a gift, the same was no longer a debtor to his father or mother, in giving the things which are wanted for the necessaries of life.

To return then from this digression. It may now be considered evident that St. Mark, beginning his account of our Saviour's reply, vii. 6, begins with the latter part of it first; and therefore that what follows from vii. 9 to 13, either was repeated in the course of the reply, or is given by way of recapitulation. And this I believe to be the case; as the following comparison of his account with St. Matthew's, setting out from the point where they first agree, perhaps will shew.

I. To set aside the historical matter, Mark vii. 3, 4; the question of the Pharisees, vii. 5, may still be correctly recorded, as well as at Matthew xv. 2. If the Pharisees came to our Lord in a body, then unless they spoke by one man, both forms of the question might be used; or what is equally probable, as the substance of both questions is the same, meaning that the interrogators came to our Lord, on such and such an occasion, to put such and such a demand; that this fact is represented in the shape of a direct interrogation may be due to the principle of the ancient historical simplicity; according to which every thing is stated directly which more refined history expresses indirectly.

II. The latter part of our Lord's reply, Matt. xv. 7–9, admits of being harmonized with Mark vii. 6–8 thus:

Matt.

Mark.

Ἐποκριταὶ

... ..

καλῶς προεφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν

καλῶς προεφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας

Ἡσαΐας

περὶ ὑμῶν

... ..

τῶν ὑποκριτῶν,

λέγων·

ὥς γέγραπται·

Ἐγγίξει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος

Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς

τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν,

... ..

καὶ τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ·

τοῖς χείλεσίν με τιμᾷ,

ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν

ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν

πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

μάτην δὲ σέβονται με,

μάτην δὲ σέβονται με,

διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας

διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας

ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.

The account will then be concluded by Mark vii. 8 : for the allusion there to the washings of cups and quarts is critically in reference to what was premised at vii. 3, 4 ; and on that ground alone might justly be considered a part of what was actually said. It is more necessary to remark that, with vii. 8, the Evangelist suspends the thread of our Lord's discourse ; and when he resumes it at vii. 9, it is with the historical premonition, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς : which might as well be rendered, He said, moreover, unto them, as, And he said to them ; the first, a mode of speaking proper for a recapitulation, and the second, one proper for a continuation.

We may suppose then that by the pause at vii. 8, the Evangelist designed to imply that Jesus made an end of speaking *there* ; and that what follows from vii. 9, was intended to explain vii. 8. The command of God was not renounced or broken, by holding the tradition of men, in the washing of cups and quarts ; which were mere formalities, and so far purely indifferent ; but in the much more serious instance of the perversion of the vow of Corban, and in such instances as resembled that. This was what our Saviour meant ;

and what St. Mark knew him to mean ; and what, therefore, by citing the first part of the reply (which otherwise, he might not have referred to at all) he considered it necessary to explain. This part of St. Mark, then, viz. vii. 9-13, must be harmonized with Matthew xv. 3-6 ; and the way to harmonize them is as follows :

	Matthew.	Mark.
I.	xv. 3.
II.	vii. 9.

which will ensue upon it with equal emphasis and propriety ; for it is in the nature of reproof to dwell on the subject of animadversion, and to repeat the same thing in other words. Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God, for the sake of your tradition ? With reason do ye annul the commandment of God, that ye may observe your tradition.

III.	xv. 4, 5.	vii. 10, 11.
------	-----------	--------------

Between these there is no other difference, than that the former says, *ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἐνετείλατο*, and the latter, *Μωσῆς γὰρ εἶπε*. Both, however, point to the same commandment, and that, the same commandment of God ; and the reason why St. Mark ascribes it in part to Moses, and St. Matthew ascribes it to God, is that the passage which follows is made up of two quotations, one from the Decalogue, actually the words of God, the other from Exodus xxi. 17, Lev. xx. 9, one of the precepts of Moses, as such.

IV.	xv. 6.	vii. 12, 13.
-----	--------	--------------

Καὶ ἡκυρώσατε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν.

Καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ· ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν, ἣ παρεδώκατε. καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε.

For as to the words, καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, Matt. xv. 5, they are no part of our Saviour's observations, but a continuation of the same traditionary quotation, which began at ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε—just before. Ye say that, whosoever shall say to his father or to his mother, Be it δῶρον, whatever might be useful to thee of mine, he shall by no means honour his own father, or his own mother. The structure of the original proves this. The redundant καὶ, which has given so much trouble to the critics, is a clear mark of a quotation; being neither more nor less than the Hebrew *vau* redundant. It will follow, on this principle, that in St. Mark's account, between vii. 12 and vii. 11, after ὠφελήθης, there is an ἀποσιώπησις; which must be filled up from St. Matthew's. And indeed the direct form of verse 12, compared with the indirect of verse 11, cannot be otherwise explained. Ye say, if a man does so and so—and ye no longer suffer him: which is an anacoluthon. The assertion, corresponding to the assumption, would evidently be wanting; and we must have understood it, though it were not expressed: If a man does so and so, *he shall not do so and so*—and ye no longer suffer him.

With regard to the rest of the narrative, or Matt. xv. 10–20, Mark vii. 14–23, there is little or no difficulty. The brief, idiomatic, and sententious form of Matt. xv. 10, 11, in the address to the multitude, may be considered a proof that these were our Saviour's very words; which St. Mark, for the sake of avoiding the ambiguity of the expressions *coming out of the mouth*, or, *going into the mouth*, has changed for what they were intended to denote, *coming out of a man*, or, *going into a man*—*coming out of the heart*, or, *going into the heart*. It is possible, however, that our Lord might have first pronounced Matt. xv. 11,

and then added Mark vii. 15, 16; connecting them by a γάρ. Οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστὶν ἔξωθεν . . . ἀκουέτω.

The remainder of the conversation, that is, with the disciples in private, is most easily to be adjusted together. I will observe only that ἀκμὴν, Matt. xv. 16, is simply equivalent to οὕτω, Mark vii. 18: after which the two accounts proceed, as the Harmony will shew in its proper place, almost in common to the end. I shall conclude, therefore, with the following general remarks.

First, as I observed on a former occasion, St. Mark, who throughout this account supplies so much original matter, did not write as the mere abbreviator of St. Matthew. Secondly, premising it all obviously for the benefit of Gentile readers, he must have written after the gospel had begun to be preached, and probably had been some time preached, to the Gentiles. Thirdly, speaking of the sect of the Pharisees, and of such and such of their customs as still in being, he wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem. Fourthly, St. Luke, who records elsewhere^w an incident very similar to that which gave occasion to this whole discourse, and though writing professedly for a Gentile, premises no similar explanation of Jewish usages; may justly be supposed to imply that St. Mark's Gospel, which does supply this explanation, was to be taken along with his own; and therefore to have written *after* St. Mark; as St. Mark, for a like reason, must have written *after* St. Matthew.

^w Ch. xi. 38.

DISSERTATION XXIX.

On the first instance of the dispute among the disciples concerning precedence.

AS I have considered it necessary to detach Mark ix. 33—end, and Luke ix. 46—50 (which, as far as it extends, is obviously the same with that) from Matt. xviii. 1—9, and much more from the remainder of this chapter; the grounds of the separation require to be distinctly stated.

For this purpose, the course of events needs not to be traced further back than the time of the return to Capernaum, which is seen now to have taken place. While our Lord, accompanied by the Twelve, was still on his way to that city, but before they were actually arrived at it; we learn, from the express testimony of St. Mark and the implicit testimony of St. Luke, that a dispute occurred among them on the subject of pre-eminence; which, though known to Jesus at the time, he did not however think proper to reprove at the time.

Again; when they were come into the city, but not yet arrived at the house to which they were going in the city; we learn, from the account of St. Matthew ^a, that the collectors of the didrachma applied to Peter, apart from Jesus, if not from the rest of the Twelve, with the inquiry, Doth not, or, will not, your Master pay the didrachma? This application to Peter, in particular, might be the effect of accident; or what is more probable and seems to be implied in the question itself, it was made to him in behalf of the other apostles, as being all the regular attendants of Jesus; and perhaps to him, as known to hold a certain

^a Ch. xvii. 24.

rank or precedence among that body. This circumstance also though known to our Lord at the time when it happened, as well as the former, was not noticed by him at the time any more than the other.

When, however, they were all come into private, before Peter had informed him of this application, and consequently before any other business could have been transacted, he shewed him, in the manner recorded Matt. xvii. 25—end, that he was already aware of it; and by Peter's own admission, who had so recently acknowledged him as the Son of God^b, ought to have been considered by him exempt from a tribute imposed for the service of God. That he might not however give unnecessary offence, he sends him to the lake, to angle for a fish; in whose mouth he should find a stater: and with this he instructs him to pay the tax in Jesus' behalf and in his own.

This coupling of Peter with Jesus, in the proposed payment, seems to have been a necessary consequence of the piece of money's being a stater; and no especial compliment to that disciple himself: for the value of the stater amounting to two didrachma, or an entire shekel, it was just equivalent to the requisite tribute from two persons. And that the coin, provided for the purpose, was a stater might be due in like manner to the circumstance that there was no single coin in circulation, exactly equal to two drachmæ, or the half shekel of the sanctuary. Hence had any other Apostle, and not Peter, been sent upon this errand, no doubt he would have been commissioned to pay the tax for himself and for Jesus in conjunction, as well as Peter.

I have made this observation merely because some commentators have thought that, by the working of a

^b Matt. xvi. 16.

special miracle in his behalf, as well as of Jesus, a kind of distinction having been conferred upon Peter, it might produce the dispute which afterwards occurred among the disciples *. Now, it should be remembered that Capernaum, whence Peter was dispatched, was at some distance from the lake; that he had to go to the lake, and to return thence; and to find out the collectors of the tribute, and to discharge his commission to them; before he could come back to the house. There was room then for much to transpire in this house, during his absence, at which he could not possibly be present—at least throughout it: and something of this kind seems actually to have taken place.

For all the particulars, connected with the history of the tribute money, are related by St. Matthew only; whose account is such as clearly to imply that nothing else could have preceded in the house, after their arrival in it, before this event. Yet St. Mark expressly, and St. Luke by implication, do each of them shew that, as soon as Jesus with the disciples was come into the house, he inquired about the subject of the dispute by the way. This inquiry then could not have preceded the departure of Peter; but took place either during his absence or after his return.

Now the disciples, according to the same authority, though questioned by our Lord himself, made no answer to the inquiry as so put; because, as we are also informed, the subject of the dispute had been which was the greatest; that is, because, for some reason or other, they did not venture to acknowledge the subject of such a dispute. But according to St. Matthew, xviii. 1, either then or some time after, they came to Jesus of

* Cf. Clemens Alexandrinus, ii. 947. l. 30—35: Quis Dives Salvetur, xxi: Origen, iii. 588.

D. Comm. in Matt. tomus xiii. 14: Theophylact, i. 93. D. in Matt. xviii.

their own accord, to prefer the very same question. And if *this* fact should appear inconsistent with *that*, xviii. 21, a little further on, may assist us to explain the inconsistency.

Peter is there mentioned as present, and as an hearer of the discourse which had just been pronounced ; a discourse, which it is needless to observe, arose solely and directly out of the question, at xviii. 1, itself. If so, Peter must have been present when that question was put ; and consequently he had executed his commission, and returned to the house, before that question was put. When the disciples therefore were interrogated by our Lord himself, and made him no answer ; (which must have been almost as soon as they were got into the house ;) Peter would be away ; when they came to him, with the same question, of their own accord, he must have been returned. The two occasions therefore, and whatever else arose in consequence of each, were entirely distinct. When Jesus put *his* question, Peter was absent ; when the disciples put *their* question, Peter was present. What is recorded between the two must consequently have transpired *after* his departure, and *before* his return : and this is that part of St. Mark and St. Luke respectively, which I mentioned above.

In support of the same conclusion we may further reason as follows.

If the disciples proposed to Jesus, of their own accord, the very thing which they did not specify at his request ; it is clear that they had some reason for their silence, distinct from the mere subject of their dispute. The absence of Peter, when Jesus made his inquiry, might possibly be that reason ; and his return, combined with other considerations about to be mentioned, might lead to the putting of their question. It is a

singular fact, that up to this period of the Gospel-history there are no instances on record of any dispute among the followers of our Lord, upon the subject of their comparative personal superiority; but after the present period there are. It is not less singular that the first instance of such a dispute followed, at no great distance of time, upon the Transfiguration. At the Transfiguration three only of the Apostles, Peter, and James, and John, were permitted to be present; and these had been strictly commanded to conceal the fact not merely from the knowledge of the world at large, but even from their fellow-disciples, until the Son of Man should be risen from the dead: a prohibition which, as St. Luke informs us, they were accordingly careful to observe.

Now the Transfiguration was altogether so mysterious and remarkable a scene; it exhibited our Saviour in so novel, and so unexpected a character; it invested him with a personal glory and majesty, so different from his former habitual humiliation: that the privilege of being present at such a transaction must have appeared to the three disciples a very high distinction, conferred exclusively on themselves; and which the very injunction of secrecy, consequent upon it, could not fail to enhance in their estimation. To have been eyewitnesses of an event; and even to have taken some part in it themselves; which they were not permitted so much as to mention to others, could not be regarded in any other light.

If then on the ordinary principles of human conduct, it was antecedently probable that the singular favour, extended to these three, in being alone admitted to such a personal and sensible manifestation of the glory of Christ, as had never been before, nor was ever after vouchsafed, would raise in their minds

some idea of their own superiority either in personal rank and preeminence, or in the degree of their Master's estimation of them compared with the rest of his disciples; then that so soon after this event, but never before it, the followers of our Lord are found disputing on this subject, seems strongly to corroborate the presumption of the cause to which the dispute is to be referred.

It is certain that, at this time, even the most intimate of our Saviour's followers were not exempt from the common mistake of their age and their nation; viz. that the kingdom of the Messiah, which they all expected shortly to appear, would be a temporal kingdom. Nor is it improbable that, under the influence of such a mistake, their very simplicity of purpose, their devoted attachment to Christ himself, would be mixed up with somewhat of selfish and worldly considerations. They could not believe that their Master was to become a great and victorious monarch, possessed of honours, wealth, and power at his disposal, and not also believe that *they*, his chosen attendants, his most immediate and confidential followers, who had sacrificed their all to attach themselves to him, should sometime be signally distinguished and rewarded by him. Nor was it unnatural that, with such expectations in common, and all being actuated by the same ambition, they should regard each other as rivals and competitors, the success of one of whom would be prejudicial to the interests of another; that they should be envious or jealous of one another; each setting himself above another; proud of imaginary distinctions; presuming on whatever might flatter their desire of personal superiority, and regarding with an evil eye any marks or expressions of real or supposed partiality, conceded to some but denied to the rest. It would be much more extraordinary had nothing of this kind ever happened;

or ever been recorded to have happened among them ; than that in one or two instances, as is the case, there should be actual proof of its having occurred.

The Twelve Apostles in particular, who had been selected by our Lord himself from the body of the disciples in general, and by his act also had been in common invested with privileges, withholden from the rest ; could not fail to be persuaded that they stood, or were destined to stand ever after their ordination, on peculiar ground in relation to him. And if there was, as there seems to have been, from the first a kind of order or gradation in the dignity of the Apostles themselves, by which four of them more especially, Peter and Andrew, James and John, were advanced to the head of the rest ; these four might be disposed, from the first, to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think. Certain it is that, in the course of their common attendance upon Christ, many circumstances subsequently transpired which, by drawing a kind of distinction between these and the rest, had a tendency to unite them together, and to discriminate them from the rest. Besides which, each two of them were brothers ; and so would naturally hold together ; and our Lord's demeanour towards them, upon numerous occasions, was such as to designate one of them, Peter, for the acknowledged head, and in some sense the representative of the whole body ; and another, John, as the personal and intimate friend of himself. Between these two in particular, there seems to have been always a good understanding ; and a degree of intimacy of which there is no proof in the case of any two among the rest : an intimacy which (if it is not first to be traced back to the time, when both they and their brethren were connected by the ties of a common partnership, before any had yet become followers of Christ) our Lord's employ-

ing them distinctly from the rest, on more occasions than one, upon confidential commissions, tended either to produce or to cement ; and of which their subsequent history in the Acts supplies fresh proofs.

As therefore the disputes among the Twelve, on the subject of preeminence, begin to be dated from the time of the Transfiguration, but not before it ; it is not an improbable conjecture that they were produced by the effect of that event itself, in disposing the three Apostles, who had witnessed it, to believe that their master's kingdom, such as they all expected, was now at hand ; and consequently that personal honours and advancements, of some kind or other, might safely be anticipated by them all. In this expectation, each would be eager for the highest rank ; and measuring the extent of their future, by the degree of their present distinctions, each would be anxious to appear and to be acknowledged the greatest. In all these instances, the point in dispute among them, whensoever it is stated, seems to be as much the question who was even then—as who should be hereafter, the greatest. Compare in particular Luke xxii. 24, which is a case to the point. The four disciples, who, as we have seen, had private, antecedent reasons for holding together, might begin to take too much upon them in comparison of the rest. The natural ardour of the disposition of Peter is proved by his whole history ; and that the sons of Zebedee, besides being persons of some rank and property originally, were by no means deficient in ambition, or in the desire of individual aggrandizement, appears from their memorable petition, preferred some months after the present time.

In every dispute then upon this subject Peter, and the sons of Zebedee, as we may presume, would take an active, and probably even a leading part. When therefore the disciples were questioned about their dis-

pute, if Peter was absent, as it would appear he must have been, they might not, or they could not know what to reply. Nor would it be any objection to the supposition of *his* absence in particular, that the Evangelist, proceeding to recount the discourse which our Lord delivered of his own accord, in consequence of their silence, tells us that he called to him previously, τοὺς δώδεκα ^c. Ever after the appointment of the Apostles, and so long as their number consisted of twelve, the phrase οἱ δώδεκα is a denomination equivalent to οἱ ἀπόστολοι; and as ordinarily employed means no more than that. After the fall of Judas, and before the substitution of Matthias, they are called on the same principle οἱ ἑνδεκα. It is not except in a special case, where a part of the whole body was expressly to be opposed to the rest, that the phrase οἱ δέκα occurs; as for instance, to discriminate the rest of the Twelve from the two sons of Zebedee. Now no such discrimination could possibly be here intended by St. Mark; for he makes no mention of the departure of Peter; and therefore in speaking of the Twelve could not use a term, which would imply that he or any other of them was absent. There is a similar instance of the use of terms, Luke xxiv. 33, 1 Cor. xv. 5, compared with John xx. 24. Besides, the discourse which follows, whensoever it might be pronounced, was doubtless designed not for a part of them, but for all; and whether heard at the time by all, or not, would doubtless be repeated to all.

Yet the act, which both by St. Mark and by St. Luke is distinctly attributed to John, I cannot help thinking is a proof, even in them, that Peter was absent. The material fact itself, the dispossession of spirits in the name of Jesus by one who followed not with them, is

^c Mark ix. 35.

rendered sufficiently probable by Matt. xii. 27 or Luke xi. 19, which shews the practice of exorcism to have been common among the Jews in our Saviour's time; and it is actually confirmed by an instance of the fact, in the case of the sons of Sceva^d. Josephus has given an account of one Eleazar, a famous exorcist in the time of Vespasian^e; and has described also a certain plant, which was to be found only at Machærus^f, of great repute in such exorcisms. He confirms too the fact in his own time, or at least the popular belief in his own time in the fact of the reality of demoniacal possession—and designates demons themselves as the spirits of wicked men*.

* Justin Martyr, Dialogus, 321. 10: ἀλλ' εἰ ἄρα ἐξορκίζοι τις ὑμῶν (sc. the Jews) κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ Θεοῦ Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ Θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, ἴσως ὑποταγήσεται (τὰ δαιμόνια). ἤδη μέντοι οἱ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐξορκισταὶ τῇ τέχνῃ, ὥσπερ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη, χρώμενοι ἐξορκίζουσι, καὶ θυμιάμασι καὶ καταδέσμοις χρώνται, εἶπον. κ', τ. λ.

Origen, Contra Celsum, i. 68. Operum i. 382. E: there were persons in the time of Celsus, exorcists by profession; whom he describes to have derived the principles and practice of their art from the Egyptians: καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν μαθόντων ἀπὸ Αἰγυπτίων ἐπιτελούμενα, ἐν μέσαις ἀγοραῖς ὀλίγων ὀβολῶν ἀποδομένων τὰ σεμνὰ μαθήματα, καὶ δαίμονας ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐξελαυνόντων, καὶ νόσους ἀποφυσώντων, κ', τ. λ.

Irenæus, Operum 123. l. 22. Adversus Hæreses, ii. v: Et propter hoc Altissimi et Omnipotentis appellationi omnia subjecta sunt: et hujus invocatione etiam ante adventum Domini nostri salvabantur homines et a spiritibus nequissimis, et a dæmoniis uni-

versis, et ab apostasia universa... et propter hoc Judæi usque nunc hac ipsa adfatione dæmonas effugant: quando omnia timeant invocationem ejus qui fecit ea.

Origen, Operum i. 526. E. Contra Celsum, iv. 33: σαφές δὲ ὅτι καὶ γενεαλογούνται Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πατέρων, τῶν Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ τῶν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. ὧν τοσοῦτον δύναται τὰ ὀνόματα, συναπτόμενα τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ προσηγορίᾳ, ὥς οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους χρῆσθαι ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Θεὸν εὐχαῖς, καὶ ἐν τῷ κατεπάδειν δαίμονας, τῷ, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ· ἀλλὰ γὰρ σχεδὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς τὰ τῶν ἐπὶ φῶν καὶ μαγειῶν πραγματευομένους. εὕρισκεται γὰρ ἐν τοῖς μαγικοῖς συγγράμμασι πολλαχοῦ ἡ τοιαύτη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπικλησις, καὶ παράληψις τοῦ Θεοῦ ὀνόματος, ὥς οἰκείου τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τούτοις εἰς τὰ κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων. Cf. 527. E. iv. 34: and 612. C. v. 45. Cf. also the Hypomnesticon of Joseph, iv. 74. 176.

An allusion occurs in the Philopseudes of Lucian to some famous exorcist, a native of Palestine; which, if the exorcist in

^d Acts xix. 13, 14.

^e Ant. Jud. viii. ii. 5.

^f Bell. vii. vi. 3.

Now this interruption (for it must be regarded as one) taking place in the midst of our Lord's discourse,

question were not spoken of as a contemporary of the writer himself, might, at first sight, be thought to refer to some traditionary and distorted account of our Saviour's miracles of dispossession: *Operum* iii. 43. cap. 16: ἐγὼ γοῦν ἡδέως ἂν ἐροίμην σε, τί περὶ τούτων φῆς, ὅσοι τοὺς δαιμονῶντας ἀπαλλάττουσι τῶν δειμάτων, οὕτω σαφῶς ἐξάδοντες καὶ τὰ φάσματα; καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐμέ χρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἴσασι τὸν Σύρον, τὸν ἐκ τῆς Παλαιστίνης, τὸν ἐπὶ τούτων σοφιστήν, ὅσους παραλαβὼν καταπίπτοντας πρὸς τὴν σελήνην, καὶ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ διαστρέφοντας, καὶ ἀφροῦ πιμπλαμένους τὸ στόμα, ὅμως ἀνίστησι καὶ ἀποπέμπει ἀρτίους, ἐπὶ μισθῷ μεγάλῳ ἀπαλλάξας τῶν δεινῶν. ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἐπιστῇ κειμένοις, κ', τ. λ. In like manner, another allusion to the same practice occurs in Lucian, in the following epigram ascribed to him: δαίμονα πολλὰ λαλῶν ὀζόστομος ἐξορκιστὴς | ἐξέβαλ', οὐχ ὄρκων ἀλλὰ κόπρων δυνάμει. *Anthologia*, iii. 23. *Luciani* xiii. Cf. *Operum* iii. 681. *Epigrammatum* xxiii.

In Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius Tyaneus*; (a work which has strong internal marks of having been purposely written as a set off to the Gospel-history of the life and miracles of our Lord;) 145. A. lib. iii. cap. 12, there is an account of a demoniac, sixteen years old, δαιμονῶν δύο ἔτη: which may be compared with the case of the epileptic patient, healed after the Transfiguration. There is another narrative, 163. A-D. iv. 3, relating to the destruction of a demon at Ephesus; and a third, iv. 6. 176. C-177. C, relating to the cure of a de-

moniac at Athens. The description of the latter case is curious: ὀρώντός τε ἐς αὐτὸ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, δεδοικότως τε καὶ ὀργίλως φωνὰς ἤφίει τὸ εἶδωλον, ὅποσαι κλαομένων τε καὶ στρεβλουμένων εἰσὶν ἀφέξεσθαι τε τοῦ μειρακίου ὦμνυ, καὶ μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐμπεσεῖσθαι. At last, when Apollonius orders him about his business, he commands him to knock down a certain statue hard by, as a proof to the spectators that he was actually gone: and the poor devil does as he was bid. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* viii. ii. 5, records something of the same Eleazar, mentioned before, so much akin to this, that we might almost suppose Apollonius had borrowed the hint from him; especially as he and Eleazar were contemporaries. Confer also *Geographi Minores* ii. Plutarchus *De Fluviiis*, 31. Nilus: of the quality of a stone, resembling a bean, used in dispossession: and Horapollon, *Hieroglyphica*, i. 24.

Eunapius, *De Vitis Sophistarum*, Πορφύριος, p. 10, reports of Porphyry that he expelled a certain demon, called Κανσάθας or Κανσάθαν, ἀπὸ λούτρον τινός. The annotator on the lives of Eunapius, conjectures that the name in question was derived from two Hebrew words, denoting *poculum Satanae*, the "cup of Satan"—and that this was the name of some bath or spring in ancient Tyre, the native place of Porphyry, so given it from some property or other, the supposed effect of the presence in it of the demon, dispossessed by Porphyry.

Even these instances, ludicrous as some of them are in

and almost as soon as he had begun to speak, was evidently made in the name of the body ; and concerned a question relating to the rights and privileges, real or imaginary, of the Apostolic body. That John therefore was the spokesman in this instance, and not Peter, which is contrary to every other case on record, is some ground for the presumption that Peter was not present at the time.

It is not a less probable account of the origin of their own question, so soon after, that Peter might by then have returned ; and been informed of what had passed in his absence. St. Matthew is express^b that the question was put on the very same day upon which the incident occurred with respect to the tribute-money ; and not long after the mission of Peter himself. The phrase, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, is among the number of *his* idioms ; as the phrase, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, is among those of St. Luke. He is equally express that it was put by the disciples of their own accord. It is evident from more than one instance of the fact in the Gospel-history, that, neither when travelling from place to place, nor when stationary in the same house, did the disciples approach indiscriminately to the person of their Master. Hence upon one occasion, as they were going up to Jerusalem for the last time, we find it accordingly specified that, ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, καὶ ἀκολουθοῦντες

their circumstances, prove that the reality of demoniacal possession at this time was an article of common belief. But, as to the accounts themselves, I must disclaim all idea of vouching for their truth ; much more of thinking for a moment of comparing

them with the gospel narratives of our Lord's miracles of dispossession, in which neither he nor the demons say or do aught which is not most natural and appropriate ; and most becoming the character and situation of each.

^b Ch. xviii. 1.

ἐφοβοῦντοⁱ. Nor can we doubt that to this custom of the Master's always walking before, or at the head of the disciples^k, is to be traced the origin of that usual mode of designating the act of becoming a believer in, or a disciple of Christ, by *following after* him; and even of that highly mystical, though apposite and beautiful description of the relation between the Messiah and his true church, which takes up so much of the tenth chapter of St. John's Gospel; and in one of the most striking and characteristic of its circumstances, that of the Shepherd's walking to and fro at the head of his flock, and of the sheep's being taught to follow him, is derived from an actual fact in pastoral life among the Jews. The phrase, προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί, is consequently to be literally understood; as implying that they came to Jesus formally, and for the express resolution of their own doubt.

Besides this, however, the very terms, in which the question is couched, are an internal, and almost a convincing evidence, that something had passed before, omitted indeed by St. Matthew, but obviously such in possibility as would thus be supplied by St. Mark. Classical readers need not to be reminded of the difference between these two propositions, τίς μείζων ἐστίν, and, τίς ᾽ΑΡΑ μείζων ἐστίν—ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; nor English readers of the plain distinction between saying Who is greatest, *and* Who, *then*, is greatest, in the kingdom of heaven? Both would imply the same doubt, and both would solicit its solution; but the latter would also imply that something must have preceded, known both to the interrogators and to the person addressed, such as might have suggested the question; which the other would not. The particle ἄρα, in its proper inferential sense, is never useless, or without

ⁱ Mark x. 32.^k Vide also 2 Kings ii. 3. 5.

signification, either in the Gospels or out of them¹; and the received translation, having omitted it here altogether, is chargeable with an inaccuracy. If the disciples, having been previously questioned on a certain point by our Lord, without returning an answer, had subsequently resolved of their own accord to ask him about it; or if, without having been questioned concerning the point in dispute, yet knowing that he was aware of it, they had agreed to refer it to him: this is the very form of words, with which they would be likely to approach him: Tell us, what *then* is the case—which *then* is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? It is certain however from St. Mark's account, that no such reference as this could have voluntarily proceeded from the disciples, prior to any question of our Lord's: if it was made then at all—as it is equally clear from St. Matthew it must sometime have been made—it must have been made after our Lord's question had been put; and consequently after what he did and said, when *his* question, though put, had met with no answer from *them*. And this point being once established, whatever account we may give of the origin of the subsequent question, (which I think is sufficiently explained by supposing the return of Peter in the mean time, and his being made acquainted with what had passed in his absence,) the entire distinctness of this part of St. Mark and of St. Luke, from any part of the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew, follows as matter of course.

A critical comparison of the accounts themselves will do much to substantiate the same conclusion.

For, not to insist on minute, and merely verbal discrepancies, of which many might be pointed out; it

¹ Cf. Matt. vii. 20. xii. 28. xvii. 26. xix. 25. 27. xxiv. 45. Mark iv. 41. xi. 13. Luke i. 66. viii. 25. xii. 42. xxii. 23.

must be evident that the discourse in St. Mark, beginning at εἰ τις θέλει^m, and ending with εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοιςⁿ, (excepting only the interruption from 38–40, alluded to above,) is an integral discourse; not only delivered at the same time, but relating to a kindred topic; the common moral, the winding up of which are contained in the ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἄλῃας, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις, with which it concludes. The same thing however cannot be said of the discourse in St. Matthew, beginning xviii. 3, and extending to xviii. 35. The subjects of that discourse cannot be considered by me at present; or I think it might be shewn that, besides the topic of giving offence, which predominates almost exclusively in St. Mark's, many others are combined with it, which however gradually they may be deduced from that, are yet very different from it. If St. Mark was recounting what passed on the same occasion, it is a natural question, why was so much less related by him than by St. Matthew? especially as that principle, which accounts for so many omissions under similar circumstances in St. Luke, is not applicable here to him; viz. that he passed over some things at present, because he knew that they would come again elsewhere. No part of what he would thus omit here, is discoverable any where in his Gospel afterwards. Or though we should confine ourselves strictly to the topic of giving offence in both, there is still the substance of 10–14 in St. Matthew, relating unquestionably to that topic, or most intimately connected with it; which yet is wanting in St. Mark.

The omission of the parenthetic matter in St. Mark, 38–40, referring to the interruption which proceeded from John, is another presumptive proof that St. Matthew's narrative belongs to a distinct time and occa-

sion, from St. Mark's. Whatever in the course of the Gospel-history might tend to the credit of the Apostles, St. Matthew, himself an Apostle, is found with a genuine Christian humility almost invariably to omit; and St. Mark and St. Luke, who were not Apostles, especially the latter, almost as regularly to notice. But with respect to what might tend to their discredit, the reverse is generally the case: and such was the nature of the interruption in question, whether in reference to the fact itself, as proceeding from a jealous impatience that the Apostolic privileges should be usurped by any who were not Apostles, or in reference to the oblique censure, passed upon the act by our Lord.

The omission also in St. Mark of what might answer to verse 7 in St. Matthew, is not unimportant; if, as it may be shewn, this verse assigns the very ground or principle of that strict personal duty, with regard to personal causes of offence, on which the discourse begins to insist from Mark ix. 43 downwards. Nor is it without its use to observe how contrary to the characteristic fulness of St. Matthew, in his account of our Lord's discourses, it would be, to suppose that *he* has blended together in verse 8, the two first of those scandals, of each of which St. Mark has made a distinct proposition; much more, that he has omitted entirely the conclusion subjoined to each verse in St. Mark, ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται: a quotation from Isaiah^o, which, in addition to its natural force and simplicity of meaning, our Saviour, by thrice repeating, had stamped with peculiar emphasis and solemnity.

On the supposition that our Lord, in St. Matthew, was merely repeating what he had lately said in St. Mark, all these circumstances of difference are easily

explained. With a general agreement both of the sentiments and of the language, such as could not fail to ensue while each was still fresh in the mind of the speaker, there might still be some particular discrepancies; unless he was purposely studious of novelty or refinement: and those points, which had been the most insisted on before, naturally would be the most summarily referred to now; and what had been inculcated with the greatest emphasis then, on that very account would bear to be the least prominently brought forward afterwards.

I shall conclude therefore by observing barely that it is no objection to this supposition of a second discourse, and on the same topic of self-abasement or Christian humility, that it implies the parties addressed in it to have been little benefited by the first. Had there been no second instance of any such dispute among the disciples as this, the disposition, which produced the first, we must conclude had been eradicated by the rebuke, which was given to the first. But as it is, there are many more instances; all of them later in their occurrence than the present time. Our Lord's repeated injunctions in favour of humility would not have been necessary, if his first had wrought their full effect. It is remarkable, however, that at the very moment when he was discoursing to his Apostles on meekness, forbearance, and self-abasement; in the midst of a sermon levelled distinctly against pride, ambition, selfishness; John addresses him not more in his own behalf, than in the name of the rest, and in a manner, which seems to expect approbation, not to be afraid of censure; complaining of some stranger who had usurped the privileges, belonging as they thought to them alone. This circumstance must prove very clearly that neither the influence of authority the most ac-

knowledge; nor the meaning of language the most clear and simple; nor the sense of duty the most unquestionable; nor the fervour of attachment the most sincere; nor the strength of faith the most undoubting; nor the possession of miraculous power however preternatural: could as yet effectually renovate and transform the Apostles, or eradicate from their minds that principle of self-love, which is the root and spring of every malicious and worldly feeling. This was reserved for the powerful energy of Christian charity; which is the offspring of Christian holiness, and both in its cause, and in its effect, is the gift of Divine grace only. We may observe however that the prohibition of these disputes is more strong and emphatic in the later, than in the earlier, cases of their occurrence: which also was naturally to be expected.

DISSERTATION XXX.

On the supplementary relation of John vii—xi. 54. to the first three Gospels.

THAT they, who are called in the Gospels the ἀδελφοὶ of Christ, were living at this period of the Gospel-history in Capernaum, as well as he, may very probably be collected from what was related elsewhere^a. It is true that, at the visit to Nazareth soon after that occurrence, some of his relations are spoken of, under the same denomination, as still resident there^b; but these, it should be distinctly observed, are only his *sisters*; the names of his brethren indeed are also alluded to, as the names of persons well known in Nazareth; but they are not mentioned as living, or as present in Nazareth at the time. There is no proof that the sisters of our Lord, whatever relation we may understand by that name, were living at Capernaum; and for ought which appears to the contrary, they might all be married, or all be settled at Nazareth.

The Gospel of St. John then, which, after the close of chapter vi. and the general statement contained in vii. 1, resumes the thread of its accounts with the conversation between our Lord and these his brethren, vii. 3–9, at a time when the feast of Tabernacles was just at hand^c; resumes it either with the return of Jesus to Capernaum, Matt. xvii. 24, Mark ix. 33, Luke ix. 46, or with his residence there, subsequent to the return and before the arrival of the feast. The same conclusion is deducible from the use of the terms μετὰ-βῆθι ἐντεῦθεν: which being stated, and intended to be

^a Matt. xii. 46. Mark iii. 21, 31. Luke viii. 19.
Mark vi. 3.

^c John vii. 2.

^b Matt. xiii. 55, 56.

received ἀπλως, can be understood, as in other cases of the like kind, only of Capernaum : not to say that our Lord's brethren, who as yet did not believe in him themselves, nor consequently attend upon him, as his disciples, wheresoever he went, were so likely to meet him in no place, as in this ; the common residence of them all.

This being the state of the case, it is my object in the present Dissertation to complete in part what was left unfinished, at the close of the twenty-third ; by shewing that, as St. John resumes the Gospel-history where the former Evangelists had, for a time, suspended it, and consequently in this instance, as well as in others, has written with a view to supply the omissions of his predecessors, so he continues it down to the time where they had resumed it again ; and therefore has so supplied those omissions, that what he has added of his own is an exact measure of what was deficient in them. The antecedent probability of some such supplement was no where greater than here ; for no where in the former Gospels was there a larger omission, or more room for supplementary matter than here ; the chasm, in the continuity of their accounts, amounting in any of them to four months, and in two of them to almost six.

First, then ; that Judæa and Jerusalem are what the brethren of our Lord mean when they talk of the *world*, and of his shewing himself unto the *world*, must be too evident to require any proof ; or if it did, the proof would be supplied by the answer of our Lord ; which shews that he understood their words of a specific admonition to go up to the approaching feast. The ultimate cause of the admonition, as we have seen elsewhere ^d, was the fact of his continued absence from

^d Supra, 250, 251. Dissertation xxiii.

Jerusalem, for the last eighteen months ; a fact, which could not be unknown to his brethren, and if they themselves were ignorant of its motive, might naturally excite their surprise. The time of the conversation in question then, as we may conclude, would be about the usual time of setting out from Galilee to attend the feast of Tabernacles ; that is, three days at least before the tenth of Tisri, the day of the fast and of the atonement ; to attend upon which was as much a matter of obligation, as to be present for the whole of the feast which ensued^e.

The reply of our Lord^f does not, as it has been falsely represented, assert that he should not go up to the feast at *all*, but merely that he should not go up *yet** ; and he assigns a sufficient reason for delaying his attendance, in the danger to which *he* would be exposed by going up too openly, or too soon. He suffered his brethren therefore, and perhaps even his apostles, to set out at the usual time before him ; and when all had been some while gone, he set out and arrived himself οὐ φανερώς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ^g. Neither then his departure, nor his arrival would be known except to those whom he might have apprized in confidence of his intentions ; that is, as we may presume, only the Twelve.

The feast of Tabernacles began on the fifteenth of Tisri, and lasted from thence, for eight days in all, to the twenty-second inclusively^h. Yet, Deut. xvi. 13—

* Augustin, Operum v. 647. Sermo cxxxiii. has an entire sermon upon this text, which nevertheless is founded upon the erroneous Latin version of it, *Ego non ascendo*, instead of *Ego non- dum ascendo* : unless indeed the Greek copy, of which that is the version, had the words, ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω, and not, ἐγὼ οὐπω ἀναβαίνω. Οὐκ is the reading adopted here by Griesbach, instead of οὐπω.

^e Lev. xvi. 29—end. xxiii. 27—32. Numb. xxix. 7—11. ^f John vii. 8.
^g Ibid. 10. ^h Lev. xxiii. 34—39. Numb. xxix. 12—35. 2 Chron. vii. 8—10.

15, Lev. xxiii. 40–42, Neh. viii. 18, Ezek. xlv. 25, the feast as such is specified as a feast of *seven* days only, and the dwelling in booths, peculiar to it, is similarly also restricted. We must consider therefore the feast as such to extend only from the fifteenth to the twenty-first of the month, inclusively; and the Jews, as we shall see by and by, always understood it accordingly. The middle day between these extremes would consequently be the eighteenth; and, ἡδὲ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσοῦσηςⁱ, our Lord first appeared in the temple: a description of the time, however, which is not so determinate as critically to denote the middle day exactly, but either the day before that, the seventeenth, or the day after it, the nineteenth; though perhaps one of those days it must denote.

We may suppose then that our Lord would set out from Capernaum about the fourteenth of Tisri, and arrive in Jerusalem about the sixteenth. In the meanwhile, there was abundance of time, since the tenth of the same month, or even earlier, as well as apparently some cause, for those reasonings, discourses, and conjectures of the people, concerning either the character of Christ, or the probability of his attendance at the feast, which are summarily related, John vii. 11–13.

Secondly, from this time forward there is no evidence to be discovered of more than perhaps *three* distinct days in the course of proceedings; two of them consecutive, the last day of the feast, the twenty-first of Tisri, and the day after that, or the twenty-second. The third, as I shall endeavour to prove, was probably the nineteenth.

For first, to judge from the practice of our Saviour at other times, when he resorted to the temple for the purpose of teaching, as at vii. 14, he resorted thither

ⁱ Ch. vii. 14.

about the usual period of the morning service ; that is, before $\pi\rho\omega\acute{\iota}$; and passed the remainder of the day in the temple. The course of proceedings from vii. 14, will consequently begin about that period of the day ; and what follows, as far as vii. 29, is so connected with vii. 14, and the rest, that all must belong to the same occasion. The same thing is true of vii. 30, as specifying a fact, the natural consequence of vii. 29 ; that our Lord's enemies would have seized upon him on the spot, but that his hour was not yet come.

With regard, however, to vii. 31, this connection is not so apparent. In conjunction with vii. 32, it merely accounts for the fact why the Pharisees sent officers to apprehend Jesus : a measure which, being produced by the observations of the multitude, vii. 31, could not precede, however soon it might follow on those observations. And these in particular might be the effect of that day's teaching, vii. 14, or the effect of any day's teaching, posterior to it ; and it would still be equally true that they were made as recorded at vii. 31. They might then be made on some other day of our Lord's appearing in public, and not on the first day of all ; and it is some confirmation of the conjecture, that they contain a reference to miracles as performed, and still performing before the eyes of the observers. Now there is no proof that miracles were performed on the day of the appearance in public first, vii. 14. It is a much stronger argument to the same effect that, if vii. 31 does not belong to a different occasion from vii. 14-30, the mission of the officers, which is specified as the next event, vii. 32, and as produced by vii. 31, could not have taken place until long after the cause which produced it.

We may take it for granted that these officers would not be sent on one day, and return to those who sent

them on the next; but would be sent upon their mission, and return to report its success, on the same day in either case. Their mission is related at vii. 32; their return and report are related at vii. 45: and between, a note of time is interposed at vii. 37, which shews that both their mission, and their return, if they took place on the same day, took place on the last and great day of the feast. This day, I shall shew by and by, was Tisri 21. But the last day of the feast cannot surely be considered the day of our Lord's appearance; for no day about the *middle* can possibly be confounded with the last day, or the *end* of the feast. Unless then it can be shewn that the allusion at vii. 37–40, is an Anticipation of the order of time; or unless it can be shewn that the officers of the Pharisees were sent on one day and returned upon another; it will follow either that they were not sent on the same day when the observations of the people were made, or that those observations were not made on the middle day of the feast. If so, between vii. 14, the time of the first appearance in public, and vii. 32, the time of the mission of the officers, there is proof of the omission of one day at least; which, if the time implied vii. 14, was Tisri 19, vii. 32, compared with vii. 37, will shew to have been Tisri 20: for the time implied vii. 37, was Tisri 21.

According to Josephus^k, every magistrate, whatever was his rank, had two ὑπηρέται, Levites; which implies that the magistrates themselves were priests. On this principle the sanhedrim would have at least 144. Now these officers, vii. 32, must be considered distinct from the parties specified vii. 44, just as the parties specified vii. 30, on the same principle are not to be confounded with the officers, vii. 32. In each of these

^k Ant. Jud. iv. viii. 14.

places, and elsewhere also as often as there is occasion for it, such persons are described indefinitely, as some of the Jews in general; but the officers, both vii. 32 and 45 and 46, are specified by name, and described by their relation to the Pharisees as such. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that the Pharisees in question, the superiors and employers of these men, to whom they stood in the relation of *ὑπηρέται*, or servants, were the members of the sanhedrim, properly so called; and this conclusion is confirmed both by the mention of the *ἀρχιερεῖς*, or heads of the courses, vii. 45, and that of the rulers, vii. 48, along with the Pharisees, and by the designation of Nicodemus, vii. 50, as one of them. Nicodemus, as well as Joseph of Arimathea, was a ruler of the Jews, and a member of the supreme council¹.

The mission of the officers, then, was a common act of the sanhedrim. If so, they were assembled before it; and it is evident that they were assembled after it: their place of assembly also, as I shall shew elsewhere, was the vicinity of the women's court. They continued assembled, therefore, all the time that the officers were away. We cannot doubt, then, that both the mission and the return of these officers happened the same day; and their report, as it is manifest, whensoever it happened, was made late in the day: for after a short consultation among themselves, in consequence of the report, the council broke up, and every man went to his own home^m; Jesus also returned from the temple to the Mount of Olivesⁿ: and that all this was for the night appears from the mention of his returning in the morning^o. Unless therefore it should be supposed that, after dispatching their officers, the sanhedrim would sit a whole day without either hearing from

¹ John iii. 1. Luke xxiii. 50.
^o Ch. viii. 2.

^m John vii. 50—53.

ⁿ Ch. viii. 1.

them, or desiring to know the success of their errand, even these officers could not have been sent until late in the day.

The proceedings of this day, then, as far as they are recorded, cannot include the particulars of an entire day. The first fact is the mission of the officers; the last is the separation of the council for the night, posterior to their return: between these there could be at the utmost, no very great interval of time. The partial account of this one day, however, which we suppose to be the last of the feast, is presumptively an argument for the equally partial account, or even the entire omission, of the proceedings on any day before it. It was the fact of the mission of the officers for such a purpose as the apprehension of Jesus, and the supernatural restraint whereby it was frustrated, which seems to have given birth to the account of this day's proceedings at all. The sanhedrim never before or after took so bold and decisive a step, as this; nor consequently, ever before or after, was the immunity of our Lord's person so seriously endangered as now. Yet the attempt of his enemies was defeated without any violence; without any concealment of his person; and by a coercion, however extraordinary or not to be expected, of a purely moral kind. This instance of the disappointment of one of the most deliberate designs upon his personal safety is a singular one in the Gospel-history: and is more memorable on every account than even those occasions when, to preserve himself from sudden violence, he had recourse to miracle on the spot.

That the particulars of this day, notwithstanding, as far as they are related, are consecutively related, is sufficiently apparent from the narrative itself. The mission of the officers was the first thing, and their

return and report were the last. Between these, vii. 33, 34. not only are distinctly addressed to them, and shew our Lord to have been acquainted with the purpose of their mission, but must have been addressed to them immediately on their arrival; and might be the very cause to excite that involuntary dread and reverence, by which they were subsequently overruled.

Soon after, the libation of water, which is justly supposed to be alluded to, as a passing ceremony, vii. 37–39, would begin to be celebrated; at least, if the time of the mission was late in the day: and agreeably to our Saviour's invariable principle of drawing instruction from the occasion, it would furnish a striking opportunity for the prophetical declaration which he pronounced accordingly. The ceremony consisted in fetching water from the fountain of Shiloah; in carrying it in procession round the altar of burnt-offerings, accompanied by the recitation of Isaiah xii. 3—With joy shall ye draw water, out of the wells of salvation: and finally in pouring out a libation thereof over the sacrifice upon the altar. The primary intention of these ceremonies was both to commemorate the miraculous supply of water in the wilderness, and to typify the anticipated blessing of Heaven, in the recurrence of the autumnal rains against the arrival of seed-time. But the appositeness of the ceremony to the future facts of the Christian history; which is the application our Lord makes of it; is too plain and perceptible not to have been remarked by almost every commentator. Isaiah viii. 6. too, the waters of Shiloah are figuratively employed as a description of the Messiah himself.

Now so far as concerned the simple libation of the water—the ceremony, according to the rabbis, took place every day during the continuance of the feast; which they also call and consider as a seven days'

feast only ^p. On the seventh day, however, that is upon the *last* day of the feast; (vide the note of the translator of Maimonides, §. 8;) not only was this part of the ceremony performed as usual, but besides that, and distinguishing this day, *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*, not merely as the *last*, but also as the *great* day of the feast, there was a procession of the priests and the Levites, carrying in their hands branches of the palm and the citron; and singing the great Hallel to instrumental music; which procession encompassed the altar of burnt-offering, preparatory to the water-libation, seven times. The whole ceremony is particularly described, from the rabbinical writers, by Dithmar in his note upon Maimonides, *De jurejurando*, i. 7. The women's court; our Lord's usual place of abode^q; was the quarter where the people assembled to witness it: and though the same ceremony was performed both morning and evening, still it is a critical circumstance that the evening's libation is described as much the more joyous and solemn of the two; and if our Lord alluded to either, it must have been the evening's libation to which he did allude: the time of the allusion admits of no other conclusion. The impression produced on the people, vii. 40, 41, by this application of the ceremony to himself, aided perhaps by the traditionary reference to the Messiah, which even the rabbis made of it, would be a very natural circumstance; and leaves it scarcely open to a question whether it was not to this incident more especially, that the emissaries of the Pharisees alluded in their own justification, vii. 46, shortly after.

We may come then to this conclusion; that John vii. 14. belongs to the nineteenth of Tisri, as some-

^p Mishna ii. 276. 9. Maimonides, *De Sacrificiis Jugibus*, x. 6. viii. 20.

^q John

where about the middle of the feast ; between which, and vii. 31, a whole day, the twentieth of the month, is omitted. From vii. 31. the account proceeds, as we shall see hereafter, to the twenty-first, and the twenty-second of Tisri in order. The twenty-first of Tisri was the day, on which the Pharisees sought to apprehend Jesus ; and they might choose to defer their attempt until that day, which was the last of the feast, for prudential reasons ; lest the people should be excited to any commotion on the one hand, and lest the opportunity of effecting their purpose should be lost on the other. The former might have been the consequence upon any earlier day in the feast ; and Jesus himself might be gone from Jerusalem, after the last. For the twenty-second of Tisri was necessarily a sabbath ; upon which no such violence could be attempted even by them.

On the twentieth of Tisri, the day after vii. 14, our Lord might not visit the temple, perhaps because (vii. 30.) a specific design had been formed, the day before, against his life ; or if he did visit it, nothing more memorable than usual occurred while he was there. And this is no improbable supposition ; for even the events of the last day of the feast, though the most specified in detail of any, are yet specified only in part, and for the sake of such circumstances, however beautiful or interesting in themselves, as transpired only upon that portion of the day : and the same thing is true of the account of the next day's proceedings also ; to which we must now pass.

The note of time, viii. 2, renders it certain that the history of another day begins to be there recorded ; and viii. 1, that it begins to be recorded in direct continuation of the preceding. As that day then was the twenty-first, this must have been the twenty-second of

Tisri; and the twenty-second of Tisri, whensoever it fell, was by appointment an extraordinary sabbath. Ἀνίσταται δὲ ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου κατὰ τὴν ὁγδόην ἡμέραν^r. It was also, as the rabbinical writers denominate it, the *clausula* or closing day of the feast; that is, a kind of supernumerary to the rest, and in some sense a restoration of the solemnity afresh^s. The same note of time, ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν, fixes the time of the return on this day to the hour of πρωῒ, or even an earlier period still; such also as appears on other occasions to have been our Saviour's rule in that respect^t.

The event therefore, which is next related, viii. 3—11, not only is consecutively related, but from the nature of the fact itself, was such as must have happened early. The adulteress was brought before Jesus, as recently surprised and in the very act; κατελήφθη, ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ, μοιχευομένη: She hath been detected, in the very act, committing adultery. If then she had been just detected, and in the act, the act had just been committed; and if she was detected in the act, and brought as soon as detected, she must have been brought early in the morning. Such an act was not likely to be surprised in the day-time.

It is of the more importance to mark this conclusion, because at viii. 12, when the preceding transaction was now over, and our Lord had resumed his teaching, there is an evident and striking allusion either to the rising of the sun, which would take place at the proper hour of πρωῒ, or to the trimming of the sacred lamps, which synchronized with the time of morning sacrifice; or perhaps to both: for the time of both was the same, and as nearly coincident as possible. This allusion is established not merely by the consideration of the cir-

^r Ant. Jud. iii. x. 4.
Jugibus, x. 5.

^s Num. xxix. 35—38. Maimonides, De Sacrificiis

^t Matt. xxi. 18. Mark xi. 20. Luke xxi. 38.

cumstances of time and place, and by the well-known principle of our Saviour's usage, but by the exception of the Pharisees against the declaration itself^t: for that exception implies that there was something in the declaration, more solemn and more emphatic than usual.

The series of conversations now begun consequently proceeds from the hour of *πρωτ'*; and down to viii. 59, the time of our Lord's departure from the temple, produced by the attempt to stone him, it is so connected by its proper notes of sequence and coherency, that it must have proceeded consecutively. I can discover no point in the whole detail, where it is possible to imagine a pause, except perhaps at viii. 20; because the subject of discourse, though afterwards continuing the same or passing gradually from one associated topic to another, is yet there perceptibly changed from what it was before. But though such a pause did take place there, there is no reason to suppose that it was a pause of any long continuance, or that the sequel of the discourse to viii. 59 did not take place consecutively, and on the same spot with viii. 12-19.

This appears first, from viii. 40, *νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι*, which implies a reference to viii. 20, where such a purpose is plainly recognised; and secondly, from viii. 59, *ἐκρύβη, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν*. He first became invisible, then passed through the midst of them, and so went out of the temple. For he was previously surrounded by the people in the treasury; and the treasury lay in the women's court: and the women's court was the second of the courts of the temple. The woman taken in adultery must have been brought to him there; for, as we may presume, she could be brought to him in

^t Ch. viii. 13.

none but her own court. Our Lord therefore had continued in one place since viii. 2, to the time of viii. 59. The period of this final departure, it may consequently be justly supposed, would not be much later than the beginning of morning service; that is, it would be about the second or third hour of the day. It followed immediately on viii. 58, when the Jews first took up stones; and it was produced by the necessity of an hasty retreat.

Now the narrative goes on to say, He went out of the temple, and so passed upon his way; and as he was passing, he saw a man, blind from his birth^u: the natural inference from which words is that the observation of this blind man, and the miracle which ensued upon it, both followed directly upon the departure from the temple; and therefore both happened the same day. It is highly inconsistent to suppose that the Evangelist means Jesus went out of the temple, and so passed on *one* day, and observed and healed the blind man on *another*; not that he did both the same day, and as he was passing on the same occasion. Now Acts iii. 2. supplies an example to prove that such, as from bodily infirmities of any kind were obliged to depend upon charity, resorted to the gates or the avenues of the temple; and resorted thither at the times of prayer in particular. This man was evidently an object of the former description^v, and known for such, who was accustomed to resort and to sit somewhere begging: and the time when Jesus left the temple was, as we have supposed, about the middle of morning prayer. It is highly probable, then, that the blind man had been brought that very morning to some one of the approaches to the temple, since our Lord first

^u Ch. viii. 59. ix. 1.

^v Ch. ix. 8.

went in ; and was accordingly discovered there by him, upon his again coming out.

This discovery was followed by his cure ; and that cure was wrought upon a sabbath day ^w. But there is no reason to suppose that this means the ordinary sabbath : the absence of the article would rather imply it was *a* sabbath, but not *the* sabbath. The 22d of Tisri would always be a sabbath, on whatever day of the week it might fall : but it could not be *the* sabbath unless it fell on the seventh ; and though this might sometimes happen, yet it was not the case in the present instance. For U. C. 782, A. D. 29, when Nisan 15 fell upon April 17, and April 17 on Tuesday, Tisri 15 fell on October 11, and October 11, according to the Tables, on Tuesday ; but according to my own mode of reckoning the days of the week, on Thursday. Upon this principle the tenth of Tisri would answer to October 6, and October 6 to Saturday ; the nineteenth would answer to October 15, and October 15 to Monday ; the twenty-second would answer to October 18, and October 18 to Thursday. We began the detail of the course of events, as we assumed, with Tisri 19 ; and we have conducted it down, as we assume also, to Tisri 22, that is, from Monday October 15, to Thursday October 18, in the last year of our Saviour's ministry. And that the 15th or 22nd of Tisri this year did actually fall on the Thursday is proved by the fact that the 15th of Nisan in the next year (which was the year of our Saviour's passion) actually fell on the Saturday. The next year was not intercalated ; therefore from the 15th of Tisri *exclusive* to the 15th of Nisan *inclusive* the number of days was 177 : or 25 weeks, and two days over. Hence if the 15th of Tisri had fallen on Thursday, the 15th of Nisan would fall

on Saturday : and *vice versa*, if the 15th of Nisan fell on Saturday, the 15th of Tisri must have fallen on Thursday. Now the 15th of Nisan did fall on Saturday : therefore the 15th of Tisri must have fallen on Thursday*.

Meanwhile it is no difficulty, even on the supposition of a sabbath, that the woman, taken in adultery, was brought to our Lord the same morning ; nor that the Jews had attempted to stone him. The object in bringing the woman was insidious ; and might be twofold, according to the event. If our Saviour had condemned the woman, he might be said both to have usurped a civil jurisdiction, and to have sanctioned a breach of the sabbath ; and if he had refused to condemn her, he might be said to have countenanced the crime of adultery. And as to the attempt at stoning ; it was the effect of a zeal, as they conceived, for God, and intended to resent the crime of blasphemy : a crime, which the Law required to be punished at any time, and in any place, on the spot^x : *περὶ μὲν γὰρ γονέων ἀδικίας, ἥ τῆς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἀσεβείας, καὶν μέλλῃ τις, εὐθέως ἀπόλλυται* y.

With respect to the sequel of the chapter, and especially from ix. 13, and forward, the scrutiny produced by the miracle, as arising out of the notice attracted by that event, it is reasonable to conclude, would follow not long after it ; and consequently in the course of the same day. The miracle was performed so early in the morning, that there was abundance of time for that purpose : nor does it constitute any difficulty, that the miracle was wrought on a sabbath. If it

* The 15th of Nisan, U.C. 783. A. D. 30, coincided with April 6 : and from October 11 *exclusive* to April 6 *inclusive* the interval is 177. Hence if October

11 was Thursday, April 6 would be Saturday ; and if April 6 was Saturday, October 11 must have been Thursday.

x Lev. xxiv. 15, 16.

y Jos. Contra Apionem, ii. 30.

was wrought so early on the sabbath, and yet was not inquired into in the course of the same day, either it attracted no notice as soon as it was performed ; (which would be palpably at variance with the fact ;) or though it might attract notice on the sabbath, nobody thought of inquiring into it on that day. But such an inquiry could have been no breach of the sabbath ; for it was not a formal act, instituted by order of the sanhedrim, nor directed to any judicial or legal purpose, but the natural result of circumstances, and intended merely to ascertain the truth of the miracle. The man was conducted by those, who had known him before, to the Jewish authorities of their own accord. A question concerning the breach of the sabbath did certainly arise out of it ; but this would be rather an argument ' hat the investigation took place on the sabbath of the 22d of Tisri ; a day of holy convocation ; at which time, the sanhedrim would necessarily be assembled together, as the account, at ix. 13 and 24, evidently supposes them to be, in their usual place in the temple. From the temple also the ejection alluded to, ix. 34, 35, amounting to a formal act of excommunication, may most naturally be supposed intended.

To the time of this excommunication, every thing from ix. 13, the beginning of the account, was manifestly regular and uninterrupted : the sequel of the transaction from ix. 35 to the end, which describes our Lord's interview with the man, who had never yet seen him in person, may consequently be justly considered to have happened on the same day ; especially as Jesus, when he heard of the man's ejection, seems purposely and of his own accord to have found him out. This honour he might shew him because he knew the sincerity and firmness of his faith, and what declaration of it he would make, on being openly called

upon to do so ; or rather, because he was the first, and as yet the only example of any believer, who had suffered shame and reproach, and suffered them willingly for his name's sake *.

Now if the sequel of the ninth chapter belongs to this day, the first part of the tenth, 1–21, delivered consecutively upon it, must also belong to the same ; and therefore be part of the proceedings still at the feast of Tabernacles. It has been supposed however a part of the proceedings at the next visit to Jerusalem, when our Lord attended the *Encaenia* ; and consequently it becomes necessary to discuss the question of its proper relation to the context, a little more at large.

I. The tenth chapter commences abruptly ; with no allusion to the time, the place, or the occasion, when, where, and in consequence of which the ensuing discourse was delivered. This might be natural enough if it was actually delivered, with little or no delay, after the close of the preceding chapter ; but on no principle would it be so, if it was not delivered until at least two months later.

II. This abruptness is not more inconsistent with the reason of the thing, than with the practice of St. John ; for no Evangelist is more careful to note the circumstances of all the transactions which he records in detail : and to his accuracy, in this respect, the present instance would constitute a singular exception, if the tenth chapter, for part of its extent at least, standing, as it does stand, isolated and independent of all connection, is not to be considered merely the continuation of the various conversations, which had been so long going on.

* Theophylact, i. 641. B. *in* καθάπερ τις ἀγωνοθέτης ἀθλητὴν
loc. : εἶρε γὰρ, φησὶν, αὐτὸν ὁ πολλὰ καμόντα καὶ στεφανωθέντα
Ἰησοῦς, ὥσπερ ἐπίτηδες ἐπὶ τούτῳ δεχόμενος.
ἐλθὼν, ἵνα αὐτὸν παραμυθῇσθαι,

III. The omission of the necessary notice of time or of place, at the beginning of the chapter, cannot be said to be supplied by what occurs at verse 22, 23 in the course of it; shewing that our Lord was then at Jerusalem, walking in the porch of Solomon, and attending the feast of Dedication. It is obviously a begging of the question to say that this notice is *reflexive*, not *prospective*; that is, intended for what had just preceded, and not for what was about to follow: which is its natural use and purpose. Besides, if that is the case, the principal verb, ἐγένετο, must possess the force either of the imperfect, *was taking place*, or of the pluperfect, *had taken place*; instead of its simple, historical, and natural sense, *did take place*. This notice may be a very proper introduction to the rest of the chapter, such as the reason of the thing and the usage of St. John might authorize us to expect; but it cannot serve as such for the first part: and its very position between the two, after the one, but before the other, ought on every principle of consistency to be a proof that it is to be understood, and was always designed to be understood of the latter, and not of the former.

IV. When the discourse in question, x. 19, was over, we find it subjoined, σχίσμα οὖν πάλιν ἐγένετο; the reference in which is either to ix. 16, or to vii. 43, each of which is an instance of the same thing before; and more probably to the latter than to the former; because the parties in this instance, as well as in that, were the Jews at large, and not as in the other case the Pharisees in particular. Both these instances occurred at the feast of Tabernacles: so then, may we presume, did the third.

V. That our Lord's hearers at the Encænïa should still be the same, either wholly or in part, with his hearers at the Scenopegia, two months before; more

especially, if they were in each case the Jews of Jerusalem; can excite no surprise. Nor is it more extraordinary, in reference even to these, that what happened at the feast of Tabernacles should be remembered at the feast of Dedication. The intermediate interval was much too short to obliterate from the memories of men, heated by the daily conflict of feeling and opinion, and sharpened to vigilance and attention by the strongest incentives which could banish indifference, all traces of the remarkable incidents which that age of wonder was daily bringing forth. The cure of the blind man, performed at the feast of Tabernacles, must have been still distinctly remembered at the feast of Dedication^z; and if for a period of two months' time, our Lord's miracles could be carried in mind, why might not his discourses?

VI. The question, x. 24, which was now put to our Saviour, implies a state of mind wavering between doubt and conviction. It shews an expectation of *some* Messiah, and a secret belief mixed up with considerable uncertainty that Jesus was he. This uncertainty the inquirers would evidently charge upon our Lord himself; ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἵρεις; that is, How long dost thou raise our expectations, and yet keep us in suspense? how long dost thou alternately gratify, and alternately disappoint our hopes? They complain therefore of some difficulty in comprehending the true character of Christ; that he gave them reason, at one time, to think so and so of it, and directly after just the reverse: and whatever this difficulty might be, producing the ambiguity and suspense of judgment in question, the very request which they proceed to subjoin is a proof that, in its cause, it was to be ascribed

^z Ch. x. 21.

to the *words* and not to the *actions* of the person addressed.

If thou art the Christ, tell us so, *παρρησία*. *Παρρησία* in its proper sense is freedom of speech; and in its secondary is openness or simplicity of speech. Hence it is opposed to *παροιμία*, or *παραβολή*, as speaking without disguise, and without reserve, is opposed to speaking in figure, or with a partial concealment of the truth. The request of the Jews, therefore, amounted to this; that if Jesus were the Christ; the Christ which they expected; he would use no mystery nor evasion; he should tell them so at once. I say the Christ which they expected; for about none else can they be supposed to inquire: and this distinction is not unimportant. To be the true Christ, and to be the Christ which the Jews expected, were very different things; and however plainly our Lord might have declared himself the Christ in the former capacity, the inquirers would still judge of his meaning from their own notions concerning the Christ in the latter; between which, and the truth of the fact as regarded the former, there would be the utmost discrepancy. Admitting the Jews to be sincere in their complaint of the obscurity, which still hung over the decision of this great national question, whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ; we may justly suppose that this obscurity was due to the conflict of new and unexpected truths with old and inveterate prejudices.

The actions of our Lord could not be mistaken; his language might: the former seemed regularly to designate him as the expected Messiah; the latter as invariably to shake this conclusion. His miracles were at all times plain and intelligible tokens of his Divine power and attributes; his professions or discourses concerning himself, his offices, and his relations, were

purposely veiled in obscurity; were never delivered except under the cloud of allegories and figures. To penetrate into the meaning of these descriptions, until they were cleared up by the event, and further illustrated by the enlightening influx of the Spirit, explaining all and teaching how to apply them all, was manifestly impossible even for our Lord's disciples: much more for a prejudiced, a bigoted, and an incredulous Jew. These topics, in the lifetime of our Saviour, and whensoever in his public addresses to the people, or his more confidential communications with his followers, he touched upon them, were truly secret and mysterious truths; the ἀπόρρητα and μυστήρια of the Gospel.

A very remarkable, and as concerned the Jews at large the first instance on record of the allegorical method of instruction in the personal character, relations, and functions of a spiritual Messiah, pursued to any length, took place, as we saw, at the beginning of this year: when the recent miracle of the loaves and fishes furnished our Saviour with the associated, but mystical emblem, applied to himself, of the living bread which came down from heaven. The harshness and obscurity of that metaphor shocked the prejudices, and led to the desertion of many who, until then, had kept company with Jesus; what then must have been its effect upon the unbelieving multitude! So necessary it is, if we would estimate rightly the perplexity, which attended the original delivery and reception of those beautiful pictures, which to our apprehensions delineate so forcibly and so correctly the true nature and functions of a spiritual Messiah, that we should place ourselves in the situation of the men of the time. With every allowance for the good disposition and the docility of the hearers, there was still ample room for

the operation of an implicit faith ; for the surrendry of their own judgments ; and for the sacrifice of their personal notions of truth or of fitness, out of pure deference to the authority of the speaker.

In the recent conversations at the feast of Tabernacles, repeated instances must have occurred, when the same figurative style of speaking was employed. In one, which is actually on record, our Lord described himself as τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν : in another, as τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου : both descriptions arising out of remarkable coincidences of time and circumstances ; both publicly delivered ; and both followed by a strong impression upon the audience. But the last, the longest, the most memorable case in point was the allegory of the true shepherd and his sheep ; if that also was now delivered. The impression made by this description of the Messiah would be the liveliest, and the difficulty of comprehending the description under which it would leave the hearers, could not be the least of all. It was not, like the former two, a mere comparison or illustration, extending only to a single point of resemblance ; but an allegory of just dimensions and of considerable length ; embracing a variety of particulars, all of which had their foundation in the facts of a real, but their interpretation in the facts of a future history. The symbolical picture was laid before the spectators in all the simplicity, and consequently in all the obscurity of the most circumstantial detail ; and the Jews, as we are told by the Evangelist^a, understood not what it meant. As with the contemplation of objects placed in too bright a light, the very simplicity of the external features rendered the substantial and latent truths so much the more difficult to be discovered. The images in their obvious acceptation were familiar enough : the

^a Ch. x. 6.

counterpart, intended beneath them, was the most profound and mystical which could be conceived.

After the delivery of the allegory, and after a pause, expressly, as it would seem, interposed to discover its effect upon the hearers; our Lord proceeded to apply the description to himself^b: which would leave no doubt that it related to Jesus Christ, and to Jesus Christ in the character of the Messiah. But what light did this application reflect on the previous obscurity of the picture? Though the image of the shepherd and his flock might be sufficiently clear in itself; and as metaphorically employed for the relation between a king and his subjects, or even between God and his people, might be no uncommon figure in their own Scriptures; yet its application to denote the relation between the Christian Messiah and his Church must as yet have been unexampled and unintelligible. Besides, there was additional matter mixed up with the application itself, which would serve only to perplex it the more. Our Lord, x. 7, affirmed himself to be the *θύρα τῶν προβάτων*, as well as, x. 11, to be the *ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*; *through* whom the sheep must gain admission into the fold, as well as *under* whom they must be fed, maintained, and protected there. This was to use a metaphor almost as harsh, and fully as incomprehensible as that of the bread which came down from heaven. He spake also of a wolf, from whose ravages the flock should be in danger; and he more than insinuated that it would be necessary for himself, the keeper and guardian of the flock, to die in opposition to this enemy: yet, strange to tell! the death of the shepherd should be the salvation of the sheep. He spake too of other flocks, distinct from his flock among the Jews yet sometime to be united to it; and he affirmed it to

^b Ch. x. 7.

be a part of his office, and an illustrious feature in his character as the true shepherd, that he should abolish all distinctions, and gather together innumerable flocks into one fold and under one shepherd.

Much more than this he said likewise, and equally hard to be understood ; which I cannot enter upon at present. If the Jews then merely did not comprehend his words before, now they charged him with raving, and being mad : He hath a demon, and is mad—why listen ye to him^c ? And even they, who thought otherwise, judged so not from superior penetration, but from greater humility of disposition ; and because the miracles of our Saviour held out the torch to his words, and made them receive what he said, whether intelligible to themselves or not, as the words of truth and soberness, and as the oracles of Divine wisdom, neither deceiving nor deceived.

It is incontestable that the Jews expected a Messiah, who should deliver their country from a foreign yoke ; be a triumphant conqueror, and a mighty potentate : and the event proves that they were determined to receive none else. The personal demeanor of our Lord had given them little encouragement to hope that he would ever declare himself such ; had he but done this however indirectly, the nation would have become believers to a man. The negative influence of long and systematic opposition to the national wish, combined with the positive effect of the national degeneracy in religion and in morality, was the true and sole cause, humanly speaking, of the final rejection of our Lord by both rulers and people. But had all, who eventually became disbelievers, yet ceased to hope that Jesus might still be the Messiah ? The proceedings, when he entered Jerusalem, only four days before his cruci-

^c Ch. x. 19, 20.

fixion, will not allow us to assert this. However slow and reluctant to make such an avowal of his character he might himself appear; his actions spoke a language not to be misunderstood; and clearly demonstrated that, were he inclined to assume that character, no one was better qualified to realize the glorious and enthusiastic picture of the ideal deliverer, so dear to the national wish. If notwithstanding the experience of the past, they still clung to the same delusive hope, it would be a motive for watching every word and every act of our Lord only the more intensely; and when in lieu of plain assurances, according with their desires and easily reconciled to their preconceived expectations, they continued to hear declarations in their obvious sense flatly repugnant to their belief, and in their secret meaning far beyond their comprehension; great in proportion would be their disappointment.

The present remonstrance, x. 24, as it appears to me, was produced by some such cause as this; by a long-suppressed feeling of impatience at finding their hopes and their wishes so often excited and encouraged, and again dejected and discouraged. There is no necessity then for the violent and improbable hypothesis that St. John has arbitrarily joined together the account of the proceedings at the feast of Dedication, with the account of what happened at the feast of Tabernacles, and yet has given no notice to that effect. The last discourse, recorded to have happened at this feast, as it must be clearly referred to, x. 26–30. in the renewal of the conversation at the next; so would be quite sufficient to account for the connection between them, though each of them took place, as they are related, some months asunder.

The transactions, then, which belong to the feast of Tabernacles as such, must be considered to be still

continued down to x. 21; after which, as it is probable, Jesus would leave Jerusalem, and according to his usage return to Capernaum. The two months' interval, between this feast and the next, we cannot suppose to have been spent in Judæa, especially as there is no intimation to that effect in St. John; but we may suppose it to have been spent in Galilee; because Matt. xix. 1, and Mark x. 1, compared with the circumstances of the history before and after them, safely lead to the inference that all, or by far the greatest part of the time between the third feast of Tabernacles and the ensuing Passover, before the point of time when our Lord passed into Judæa out of Peræa, was spent in Galilee: in which case, St. John would naturally be silent about it. But if this interval was spent in Galilee, we may take it for granted that it was spent at Capernaum. Our Lord's circuits, for the present, were all over, and the winter-season was at hand: no place would be so likely to be made the scene of a temporary, but stationary residence, as the usual place of his abode; and had he not been known to have remained there, for some time after the last return which *they* mention, St. Matthew and St. Mark would not describe his final departure thence to take place so soon apparently after that return; though in reality six months later than it.

The feast of Dedication, John x. 22, is evidently the feast next in order to the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2: and it is another presumptive proof either that our Lord had been absent during all the intermediate time from Jerusalem, or that nothing had since occurred upon the spot, similar to what had taken place before; that we meet upon this occasion also with the mention of a renewed attempt to stone him^d. The *παλιν* in this

^d Ch. x. 31.

allusion can be referred to viii. 59, an incident at the feast of Tabernacles, only. We may conclude therefore that since the time of the feast of Tabernacles our Saviour and the Jews of Jerusalem did not meet again, until they met in Solomon's porch; or if they did, that nothing again occurred like what occurred before. The former of these suppositions is confirmed by the silence of St. John, and the latter is negatived by the experience of the past; for had they ever met again as before, something, as it may justly be presumed, would have arisen to make the adversaries of Jesus desirous of stoning him as before.

The proceedings at this feast as related, beginning with x. 22, cannot embrace more than a single day; and being prematurely terminated by the attempt upon the life of Christ, these particulars themselves were probably the whole of what then transpired; at least in public. After the day of that attempt Jesus appeared no more openly; and until that day he does not seem to have visited the temple: the conversation in the porch of Solomon, which took place upon that day, occurred on the first opportunity furnished by his appearance in public.

The feast of Dedication began on the 25th of the Jewish Casleu, and lasted for eight days in all. The 25th of Casleu was the 69th day *inclusive* from the 15th of Tisri *exclusive*; and consequently in the third year of our Saviour's ministry, when Tisri 15 fell upon October 11, Casleu 25 fell upon December 19. The first of the eight days then coincided with December 19, and the last with December 26: a statement, sufficient by itself to prove that the feast of Dedication this year fell out in the midst of a Jewish winter^e; which yet would not be always the case. But this

^e John x. 22.

year the Passover fell as late as it could, and therefore so did every other feast: if the Passover had fallen as early as it could, the feast of Dedication would have fallen out a month earlier; which would not have been so much in the winter *. Moreover, when Tisri 15 (as we have proved was the case) fell upon Thursday, Casleu 25 must have fallen on Wednesday: the first day of the feast then was a Wednesday; and consequently so was the last. The particular day, on which the conversation in Solomon's porch transpired, must be uncertain; but if we may conjecture that Jesus repaired to the temple in this instance about the same time as in the former, viz. μεσούσης ἡδὴ τῆς ἐορτῆς; it might take place on the last day of Casleu, Sunday December 23, or on the first day of Tebeth, Monday December 24. If our Lord retired from Jerusalem soon after the attempt on his life, he consequently retired thence before the end of the month of December.

The quarter to which he retired is simply described as the region beyond Jordan^f; the reference in the πάλιν being to vi. 1 previously; where a similar visit to the country on the other side the lake, and consequently beyond the Jordan, had been already recorded. That this place was Bethabara, where John at one period of his ministry was certainly baptizing^g, and which also was situated beyond the Jordan, would not

* Hieronymus, iii. 1702. *ad princip.* in Aggæum, ii. 10: *Nonus est mensis, quem nos Novembrem vel Decembrem dicimus. Nisan enim apud Hebræos mensis est primus, qui appellatur mensis novorum: eo tempore quo Pascha faciunt, id*

est incipiente veris exordio: qui secundum lunæ cursum sæpe quandam partem mensis Martii possidet, interdum incipit in Aprili. ergo si Nisan Aprilem intelligimus, nonus mensis secundum supputationem Hebræorum, December erit.

^f Ch. x. 40.

^g John i. 28. iii. 26.

be a necessary consequence. The reference in τὸ πρῶτον, x. 40, does not specify Bethabara as such; or relate to the incident recorded i. 28, which happened there; but merely to the order of time between the ministry of John and the ministry of Christ; for the former was prior, and yet only preparatory to the latter: though it may still be true that the scene of John's ministry might be changed in the course of its continuance, from the eastern side of the Jordan, where it had begun, to the western, into which it subsequently passed ^b.

It is not indeed improbable that Bethabara might be a general name for the Aulon, or Perichorus of Jordan, on its eastern side ^{*}; or for some part of it, nearer to the southern extremity of the lake of Tiberias, than to the northern extremity of the lake Asphaltites; and consequently to the ford in the vicinity of Jericho. The denomination itself means *house*, or *place* of passage;—and it might obviously be given to any of the fords of the Jordan. Now there was one such ford opposite to Scythopolis, and therefore not far from Tiberias ⁱ; besides the ford near Jericho. The most ancient manuscripts, however, in the time of Origen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others, instead of Bethabara beyond Jordan, read Bethany beyond Jordan^k; and the exception which Origen takes against this reading, and his consequent correction of the text

^{*} This conjecture derives some countenance from Judges vii. 24, where the Ephraimites are said to have taken possession of the waters absolutely, “unto Beth-barah and Jordan.”

^b Ch. i. 28. iii. 23. 62. ⁱ Reland, Palæstina, i. cap. xliii. 279. Cf. 1 Macc. v. 52.

^k Origen, Operum iv. 140. In Joh. tom. vi. 24. See also Epiphanius, i. 435. A. Alogi, xiii: Theophylact, Operum i. 523. B. In locum: Chrysostom, Operum viii. 96. D. Homilia in Joh. xvii. 1. Add to these, the anonymous authority, quoted by Suidas, in Βηθανία, who recognises the reading in question, even while he contends that it is erroneous, and should be corrected for Bethabara.

for Bethabara, are neither of them founded upon just critical grounds; but on mere presumption of what ought to be. Among the thousand towns and villages which were comprised in all Palestine, it would be nothing extraordinary if many bore the same names; which in our Saviour's or in St. John's time might still be in existence, and still known as distinct; but by the time of Origen, after the numerous desolations which the country had suffered, might have become totally extinct; and even their names have perished with them. Moreover, if the text of St. John originally exhibited Bethabara; and Bethany, as Origen himself contends, was a name so completely unknown on the other side the Jordan, who would have thought of corrupting the former for Bethany? But his own example proves how natural and obvious it would be, under such a presumption of the truth, to change Bethany into Bethabara*.

On this point, however, it is not necessary for me to dwell. I make these observations merely to shew that, by retiring into this quarter in particular, our Lord would be nearer to Galilee than to Judæa; though strictly in neither at the time; and if he was less than one day's journey removed from Capernaum, he would be more than two days' journey distant from Jerusalem. This quarter however was one, which he had probably never visited, since the commencement of his ministry, at least so as to reside within it; and yet as it had been the principal, if not the exclusive scene of the labours of John, it was but natural that its inhabitants should still remember both his preaching in general, and his testimonies to Jesus in particular;

* Bethany is the reading adopted by Griesbach; for whose reasons the reader is referred to his edition of the Gospels.

which accounts for the belief of many there upon our Lord¹.

The length of the residence in these parts is not specified ; but I have shewn elsewhere^m, that the visit was speedily followed by our Lord's return to Jerusalem, preparatory to the raising of Lazarus : the time taken up by which return, and by the performance of the miracle, it is possible satisfactorily to determine.

Lazarus began to be sick, while our Lord was still in this neighbourhood ; and whatever we may conjecture concerning the nature of his sickness, which its rapid consummation seems to designate as a species of fever ; his death had not yet taken place, when the news of his illness was brought to Jesusⁿ : for Jesus speaks of him as still sick but not yet dead, when he says, This sickness is not unto death. When our Lord however set out to return, it is certain that he was then dead^o. Now he set out upon his return on the day but one after he received the message of the sisters^p. The death of the sick man then took place either on the day when the message was received, or on the day after it.

When Jesus arrived at Bethany, he had been either four days dead, or four days in the tomb, or both^q ; for it was the custom of the Jews to commit the bodies of the dead to the grave as soon as possible ; so that the burial of Lazarus on the day of his death itself, especially if he died of a fever, would be nothing extraordinary. The distance of the quarter where our Lord would receive the first intimation of his sickness, as we have shewn, was probably more than two, but less than three days' journey from Jerusalem. Hence if he had received the message of the sisters on *one* day ; if

¹ Ch. x. 41, 42.
^o Ib. 7—14.

^m Supra, 249. Dissertation xxiii.
^p Ib. 6.

^q Ib. 39.

ⁿ Ch. xi. 3—6.

Lazarus had died and been buried on the *next*; and if Jesus himself set out on the *third*: he would arrive at Bethany in the course of the *fifth*; when, as it is asserted in the narrative^r, the dead man would actually have been three days, and a part of the fourth day in the grave.

This being the case, it seems superfluous to prove that our Lord must have arrived within seven days of the death at least. But according to Josephus^s, the time of mourning lasted for that number of days; during which it was customary to receive and entertain, οὐκ ἄνευ ἀνάγκης, the relations or friends of the dead: and in consequence of this necessity, many whose means were not adequate to the expense incurred, oft-times were reduced to poverty. Now this mourning for Lazarus, and this resort of his friends to the house of the sisters, were still going on at the time of our Lord's arrival^t. His arrival then took place certainly within *seven* days after the death of Lazarus.

The miracle ensued so soon after the arrival, that Jesus did not even enter the village^u; but until he had performed it, continued without; going only in the mean while to the tomb; the situation of which, according to the usage of the Jews, except in the cases specified elsewhere, would necessarily be somewhere apart from the village itself^v.

It appears then that the death of Lazarus ensued, in the natural course of things, on the day after our Lord heard of his sickness; and that he himself was too far from Jerusalem to travel thither in one day, or even in two days. He could not therefore return in time to restore him to health on the spot; and as to working a miracle in this instance, as he had sometimes

^r Ch. xi. 17. 39. ^s Bell. Jud. ii. i. 1. ^t John xi. 19. 31. ^u Ib. 30.
^v Supra, 326. Dissertation xxiii.

done before, by an act of volition, or by mere word of mouth, it is manifest that the sisters did not expect it from him ^w; and had he even done so, neither would the splendour of the miracle have been so great, nor its evidence have been so decisive: for the distance of the author of the miracle from the subject of it; that is, between the cause and the effect of the cure; must have had a tendency to obscure its truth. The miracle might be equally real, but its reality would not be so apparent. This therefore was most probably the reason why, after hearing of the illness of Lazarus, Jesus yet remained two days where he was.

The news of the miracle was taken, soon after its performance, by some of those who had witnessed it; and communicated to the Pharisees ^x: and the effect of this communication was the resolution concluded, and from that day forward acted upon, to put our Lord to death ^y. The formation of such a purpose, which it is implied by xi. 54, was known to Jesus, induced him again to depart from Bethany; and no longer to remain publicly in Judæa.

The quarter to which he retired was Ephraim; a city, which Epiphanius, as well as St. John, places on the borders of the desert country ^z: συνοδεύσαντός μοι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Βαιθῆλ, καὶ Ἐφραῖμ, ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρεινὴν ἀνερχομένῳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱεριχοῦς: and which Jerome describes as *Villa prægrandis, Ephræa nomine, contra septentrionem, in vicesimo ab Ælia milliario* * ^a.

At Ephraim the Gospel of St. John leaves our Sa-

* Bethela and Ephraim are mentioned by Josephus, *De Bello*, iv. ix. 9, as two *πολίχνια* near to each other, and within a moderate distance from Jerusalem; which Vespasian reduced early in the spring quarter of U. C. 822.

^w Ch. xi. 21. 32. ^x Ib. 46. ^y Ib. 47—53.
ⁱ 133. B. C. Ebionæi, ix. Vide also Joshua xvi. 1.
435. De Situ et Nominibus. Cf. 439.

^z *Adversus Hæreses*,
^a *Operum* ii. Pars i^a.

viour for the present ; and brings him back to Bethany only six days before the next Passover^b. The question which we have now to consider is whether any of the three former Gospels found him at Ephraim ; and having taken up the course of things after the retreat thither, brought him from thence to Capernaum, before the last circuit itself. This Gospel I believe to be St. Luke's ; and on the proof of this conclusion I shall enter in the next Dissertation.

^b Ch. xii. 1.

DISSERTATION XXXI.

On the supplementary relation of Luke ix. 51—xviii. 14. to the first two Gospels.

IT is generally agreed that, so far as ix. 50, the Gospel of St. Luke accompanies the Gospels of St. Matthew and of St. Mark; but from ix. 51—xviii. 14, it proceeds, apparently, by itself. On the supposition then of the regularity of this Gospel throughout, the intermediate matter between these extremes, is peculiar to St. Luke; and as the mere statement of the extremes themselves is sufficient to prove, it is no small portion of the whole.

The point of time, at which St. Luke ceases to accompany St. Matthew and St. Mark, is with the return to Capernaum, prior to the last feast of Tabernacles; and the point of time, at which he rejoins them, is with the close of the last journey up to Jerusalem, when our Lord either had already passed, or was just on the eve of passing out of Peræa into Judæa^a. On the same supposition therefore of St. Luke's regularity, as before, it follows that the whole intermediate matter, peculiar to his Gospel, belongs to the interval of time between that return to Capernaum, and that passage from Peræa into Judæa; an interval which, as we have had reason to conclude already, could not comprise less than the last *six* months of our Saviour's ministry, and possibly comprised even more.

Throughout the whole of these details, which we suppose to be thus comprehended, there are numerous historical notices, some express, others implicit; which

^a Matt. xix. 1. 13. Mark x. 1. 13. Luke xviii. 15.

demonstrate that our Lord, all the time, was travelling and teaching; and travelling and teaching upon his way to Jerusalem. There are evidences therefore that a journey to Jerusalem, all this time, was still going on; and going on with the utmost publicity; a journey, expressly undertaken in order to arrive at Jerusalem, and wheresoever it might have begun, and whatsoever course it might take meanwhile, yet known and understood to be tending to that one point, and ultimately to be concluded by arriving there at last. There are consequently evidences of a circuit; and if that was a circuit belonging to one and the same occasion, of a circuit begun and prosecuted on a very general scale; the *fourth* of the kind, of which the Gospel-history has yet supplied the proof.

All these indications are of manifest importance, in fixing the period to which the whole of Luke ix. 51—xviii. 14. inclusively is to be referred. During the last six months of our Saviour's ministry, there were three feasts, all which he attended personally in their order; the third feast of Tabernacles, the third feast of Dedication, and the fourth Passover: between which feasts and these intimations of the direction, or of the circumstances of his motions, preparatory to arriving at Jerusalem, there is this kind and degree of congruity; that all those intimations may most easily, most obviously, and most naturally be understood of a journey, preparatory to the last Passover, but can none of them, with any propriety, be understood of a journey preparatory to either of the other two feasts, which most immediately preceded it.

For there is none of these indications, which does not prove that, while our Lord was thus travelling up to Jerusalem, he was travelling in the most open manner; and was attended by crowds of followers where-

soever he went. But it is certain from John vii. 10, that he went up to the third feast of Tabernacles in a manner the most opposite to this; and until he appeared in the temple, about the middle of the feast, that he had not been seen, much less had been publicly accompanied from Galilee by any one. If the same thing is not expressly asserted of the feast of Dedication ensuing, it is yet very plainly implied. The incident in Solomon's porch, John x. 22, which transpired at that feast, as we had reason to conclude in the preceding Dissertation, was produced by the sudden discovery of the presence of Jesus as he was walking in that porch: and the same prudential motive, which required the concealment of his purpose of attending at the feast of Tabernacles, would much more require the same secrecy at the feast of Dedication; for if his life was in danger before the former feast, it was much more so at the latter. These indications then of the motions of our Lord, of their direction, their final end, or their circumstances, preparatory to some visit to Jerusalem, cannot be referred to the visit at the feast of Dedication; and we have seen that neither can they be referred to the visit at the feast of Tabernacles: it remains therefore that they must be referred to the visit at the feast of the Passover: a conclusion, which may further be confirmed as follows:

I. The last journey to Jerusalem, and the attendance at the last Passover, are the only journey to Jerusalem, and the only attendance at any feast, which the first three Gospels have placed on record. Yet St. John's Gospel proves that our Lord went up to Jerusalem five several times besides. Now all these indications in St. Luke may clearly be referred to that one journey; and it is a strong presumptive argument of the necessity of this reference, that no visit to Jeru-

salem is specified by him but the last ; nor consequently could any journey, preparatory to such a visit, be specified by him but the last. It is a similar argument, that xviii. 15, in St. Luke, at a point of time which as well as the rest belongs to this journey, coincides with Matt. xix. 13, and Mark x. 13 ; both points of time which indisputably belong to the last journey to Jerusalem, and to a period of the journey, when it was not far from Jerusalem itself.

II. From all these indications in St. Luke it is distinctly to be collected, that Jesus was still travelling to Jerusalem ; nor before xviii. 15, or rather, xix. 29, is there any proof that he was already arrived there. All these indications therefore alike may belong to the visit at the last Passover, and to the journey preparatory to that visit, if this journey had been going on from ix. 51—xviii. 15, or xix. 29 : but not upon any other principle. Much less then can they be referred to different visits ; one at the feast of Tabernacles, another at the feast of Dedication ; and to the different journeys respectively preparatory to each. For in each of these instances, the Evangelist is still giving an account of the events which happened *by the way* : he says nothing as yet of what happened at the journey's end. But as the journey was begun for the sake of arriving at Jerusalem, the account of the journey could never be complete without an account of the journey's end ; events by the way would never be related except as preliminary to the history of the events which ensued upon the arrival at Jerusalem. These are decided objections to the supposition of journeys before either the feast of Tabernacles or the feast of Dedication ; and they are just as decidedly arguments in favour of a journey before the last Passover : for both the arrival at Jerusalem, and the events which ensued upon

it, as well as the journey which conducted unto it, are all as clearly specified upon this principle, as they are omitted to be specified on the other.

III. If some of these indications belong to a journey before the feast of Tabernacles, others, to a journey before the feast of Dedication, and others, to a journey before the feast of the Passover; then between some of the number and the rest, our Lord must have been up to Jerusalem, and come back again, and have been returning thither a second or a third time afresh: yet no notice is interposed to that effect: he is represented throughout as travelling in one direction, and for ought which we can discover to the contrary, as travelling on the same occasion. All this would be consistent and natural, if this occasion was that of the last journey to Jerusalem; for then it is impossible that any other representation could have been given. But not so, if the occasions themselves were distinct; and many weeks, not to say months, asunder. This would be to introduce inextricable confusion and perplexity. For with such a strange amalgamation of accounts, who could undertake to separate them; and to say, Thus much of the whole belongs to such a time, and Thus much to such another?

IV. The regularity of St. Luke's Gospel, up to ix. 51, has been, as I think, so fully established, that we may justly assume the fact of its regularity for the remainder also; and the assumption will be confirmed upon its own grounds of proof hereafter. This being the case, there can be no question that Luke ix. 50, coincides with a point of time which answers to the middle of the *third* year of our Saviour's ministry; that is, Luke i—ix. 50, inclusive brings down the series of the Gospel-history to within six months of its

close. The sequel therefore, viz. Luke ix. 51—to the end, must all be comprised within these six months, or a very little more: and as ix. 51 in particular synchronizes with a point of time nearer to, or further off from either of the extremes in question, it will take up the whole, or merely some part of it in general.

Now such is the notice premised to this division of the Gospel ^b—ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ: that it could not be premised to any thing but the occasion of our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem. The words should be rendered thus; Now it came to pass, as the days for his being taken up were beginning to be fulfilled, that he himself also steadfastly settled his countenance to go to Jerusalem. It would be a waste of argument to prove that the days of his being taken up; αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ; can bear no other construction than that of the period appointed for our Lord's reception into heaven. There are analogous phrases in ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως, the day when the Baptist should be manifested; in καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως, the seasons when refreshments should come; in ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως, the season for St. Paul's being released: and the like ^c. That this period was a definite one appears clearly from John xiii. 1. xvi. 28. xvii. 1. 11—and from many other passages of Scripture which might be quoted. That it coincided with the time of the Ascension is equally evident, both from the necessity of the case, and from the very expression employed to designate it. Ἀνάληψις, the act of taking up or of being taken up, is regularly derived from the verb ἀναλαμβάνω; and this verb, or some synonymous one, such as ἀναβαίνω, ἀναφέρομαι, ἐπαίρομαι, is the

^b Ch. ix. 51.

^c Luke i. 80. Acts iii. 19. 2 Tim. iv. 6.

verb invariably employed, in speaking of our Lord's ascent into heaven ^d.

The period of the Ascension, as we saw elsewhere, was also the final close of our Lord's ministry; for until then, even after the resurrection, he was still in some sense present with his disciples on earth, appearing unto them at intervals for the space of forty days, and λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ^e: but after the Ascension, he was no longer present with them in any sense, as before. The period of the Ascension, then, or in other words, the close of our Lord's personal ministry, is very clearly here pointed out; and the whole of the notice, both in the language and in the sentiment, is much the same with what St. Luke specified not long before, as the topic of the colloquy on the mount; when Moses and Elias appeared in glory, and spake to our Lord of his ἔξοδος or departure, which he was about to bring to pass in Jerusalem ^f. The same conclusion follows from the peculiarity of the phrase, τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστέγηριξε; which describes the feelings or resolution of one, who is embarking on a business of more than usual seriousness, or of more than ordinary danger; such as was the last journey to Jerusalem in particular, the most solemn and momentous event in our Saviour's history, and not to be consummated except by his death and passion, with all their ignominious and all their afflicting circumstances; every one whereof was well known beforehand to himself*. Be-

* The phrase, "To set the face," is certainly of common occurrence in the Old Testament, to denote the direction of a journey: see Genesis xxxi. 21: 2 Kings xii. 17: Jeremiah xlii. 15—17: xliv. 12: Ezekiel xxi. 16: and Daniel ix. 3: x. 15. yet so as to describe something like a steadiness of purpose relating

^d Mark xvi. 19. Acts i. 2. 11. 22. 1 Tim. iii. 16. John xx. 17. Acts ii. 34. Rom. x. 6. Eph. iv. 8, 9. Luke xxiv. 51. Acts i. 9. ^e Supra, 149. Dissertation xix. Acts i. 3. ^f Luke ix. 31. Compare 2 Pet. i. 15.

sides which, but whether by an intentional, or an unintentional coincidence, I do not say; these are the very terms or nearly so in which the prophet Isaiah makes the Messiah allude to his approaching sufferings, and express his determination to bear them all : Therefore have I *set my face* like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed.

There can be little question then that at Luke ix. 51, the approach of the last Passover, and the occasion of the last visit to Jerusalem, begin to be distinctly pointed out; and consequently that both the third feast of Tabernacles, and the third feast of Dedication, were already passed: that is, that two months at least, out of the six which we have assigned to this period in general, had now elapsed. If so, the course of events, from this time forward to the close of our Saviour's ministry, cannot embrace more than four months; and may embrace even less.

Now it is said that Jesus prepared to execute his intention of proceeding to Jerusalem, by sending messengers in the first place to a certain village of Samaria: whence it must be evident that he had to pass through Samaria. Samaria extended across the western division of Palestine, between Judæa and Galilee: and if a person, travelling towards Jerusalem, had to pass through Samaria, one of the two following suppositions must necessarily have been the case; either he was in Galilee, and passing from thence directly to Judæa; or he was in Judæa, and passing from thence directly into

to it. But the Hebrew verb in none of these instances is rendered in the Septuagint by *στηρίξω*. The phrase *στηρίξαι τὸ πρόσωπον* occurs in the Septuagint, as the version of Jeremiah

iii. 12: xxi. 10: and of various passages in Ezekiel, which the context shews to relate to denunciations of more than usual solemnity of character.

Galilee ; intending in each case that his journey should terminate at Jerusalem in the end. That the latter supposition was actually true of our Saviour's case, at the time, may be shewn by the help of St. Luke's narrative itself, as follows.

The mission of the Seventy^h took place in the course of the journey now undertaken, and after the passage through Samaria. The mission of the Seventy then took place either in Galilee, or in Judæa. But the mission of the Seventy was preparatory to a circuit of our Lord himself : they were appointed and sent before his face into every city and place whither he himself was about to come. If the mission then took place in Galilee, the circuit, which followed it, began in Galilee ; but if the former took place in Judæa, the latter also began in Judæa. Now no circuit of our Lord's ever began in Judæa ; nor unless Judæa and not Galilee had been the proper scene of his ministry from the first, could any of his circuits as such have begun in Judæa. Every circuit, whether general or partial, which had yet been undertaken, as we have seen, was undertaken in Galilee and confined to Galilee. The notion of a circuit begun in Judæa to arrive at Jerusalem, unless the circuit was confined to Judæa—and much more the idea of a passing on purpose from Galilee, through Samaria, preparatory to such a circuit in Judæa ; is preposterous. Even after the mission and return of the Seventy, when our Lord had begun his progress in their track, it is certain that, for a part of the time at least, he was still within the dominions of the tetrarch of Galilee ; and as to the circuit's being undertaken in Judæa, and much more its being confined to that country—at a time when it must be apparent that the progress was got

into Judæa, there is no proof of its doing more than travel, with the necessary diligence and dispatch, along the high road from the passage of the Jordan to Jerusalem. The mission of the Seventy then took place in Galilee; and the passage through Samaria, before their mission, was consequently a passage from somewhere in Judæa to somewhere in Galilee. If so, our Saviour was previously in Judæa.

Now the last notices in the former Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Mark ⁱ, clearly represented him to be in Galilee: but this was a little before the feast of Tabernacles; and consequently two months at least before Luke ix. 51: within which time it is manifestly possible that he might both have left Galilee, and returned thither again, prior to Matt. xix. 1, or to Mark x. 1. The Gospel of St. John, to a certain extent, confirms this possibility by the matter of the fact; for after shewing that our Lord was thrice at Jerusalem within that time, it brought him, as we saw, to Ephraim: and there for the present it left him.

The utility of this Gospel, and its critical adaptation to the rest, must consequently now begin to be strikingly exemplified: for if our Lord, according to the authority of St. Matthew and of St. Mark, in the course of the last circuit passed directly into Judæa out of Peræa, and directly into Peræa out of Galilee; he must have returned from Ephraim sometime after St. John left him there, and come again into Galilee sometime before St. Matthew and St. Mark take him thence. If he had not again left Ephraim, which was in Judæa, he could not have come into Judæa out of Peræa; and if he had not returned into Galilee, he could not have passed into Peræa out of Galilee. Now Ephraim

ⁱ Matt. xviii. 35. Mark ix. 50.

lay indeed in Judæa, but close upon the verge of Samaria; and one who was desirous to return into Galilee from thence it is morally certain would pass by the readiest route, and consequently through the country between. It is such a return in the present instance; a return from Ephraim through Samaria; which I suppose to be the return into Galilee, recorded by St. Luke preparatory to the mission of the Seventy: a supposition so simple, consistent, and probable, that the mere statement of it is enough to vouch for its correctness; and while it is perfectly in unison with the accounts of each Gospel in particular, to perpetuate, connect, and fill up completely and satisfactorily the united accounts of all.

It may be objected, however, and it is the only material objection, that the motive assigned to the rejection of Jesus by the Samaritans^k, because his face is said to have been going to Jerusalem; his face was as though he was going to Jerusalem; is at variance with our supposition; and leads to the inference that the course of the journey lay actually in the direction of Jerusalem. And had the Evangelist been speaking of the *direction* of the journey, and not of the *purpose* of him who had undertaken it, this inference might be just. But from the word *πρόσωπον* in this instance, distinctly in allusion to the same term as used before^l, it is manifest that this was not the case. Jesus *settled* his *face*, it was then said, to go unto Jerusalem; the Samaritans saw his *face*, it is now said, that it was going to Jerusalem; that it was as of one going to Jerusalem. In both these cases, the meaning of the term is the same; and as it signifies in the first only a fixed purpose and determination, it can signify no more in the last.

^k Ch. ix. 53.

^l Ch. ix. 51.

It is sufficient to explain the words, and, on the principle of the old religious and national animosity between the Jews and the Samaritans, to account also for the conduct of the latter, to suppose that, when Jesus departed from Ephraim to pass through their country, it was known, or on probable grounds was collected, that he was repairing to Galilee, intending to commence a public tour to Jerusalem from thence. Even upon this occasion, he set out with more state and solemnity than he had ever observed before; for he sent forward messengers to prepare for his reception. These messengers must have been acquainted with his intention, and were probably some two of the apostles; perhaps James and John, who resented the indignity done to their Master so much more warmly than the rest. The Samaritans might learn the fact of the same intention either from these his emissaries, or from the direction and appearance of his outward progress itself; nor is it surprising that some of them should be little disposed to respect a Jewish prophet, though that prophet might be our Saviour himself, if he was personally unknown to them, and had never resided, much less preached in their country, except for the two days which, at the outset of his ministry, he spent at Sychar.

This description of things however is not less reconcilable to the idea that the course of the journey, in this passage through Samaria, was not, at the time, in the actual direction of Jerusalem, but merely designed to terminate there at last; than another, which occurs sometime after^m: It came to pass, as he was going to Jerusalem, that he went through the midst of *Samaria* and *Galilee*. There is no authority for changing the order of these words, or putting *Galilee* before *Sama-*

^m Ch. xvii. 11.

ria; in which case, whatever occasion was taking our Lord to Jerusalem, St. Luke must be understood to affirm that he went through Samaria *first*, and through Galilee *last*; in other words that, for one part of his journey, the direction in which he was proceeding was as much *away* from Jerusalem, as during the rest of it might, or it must have been *towards* it. Nor is it a parallel case, as I shall shew hereafter, to quote Luke xix. 29; though our Lord came to Bethany before he came to Bethphage, and Bethphage was nearer to Jerusalem than Bethany. Directly after this notice in St. Luke, xviii. 15, compared with Matt. xix. 13, Mark x. 13, proves that Jesus was either in Judæa, or on the point of passing into it. The truth is, all these occasional notices from ix. 51—xvii. 11, belong to the course and continuance of one and the same journey, begun from Ephraim and terminated at Jerusalem; but visiting in the interim Galilee, and Peræa also: the particulars of which even St. Luke does not relate in detail, but only here and there; with such admonitions interspersed, as may serve to keep the reader in mind what Jesus was doing, where he had been, or where he was, and what end he had in view by the journey all the time.

As the feast of Dedication expired upon the third day of the tenth sacred month, and as we have seen there could be no great interval of time between the departure from Jerusalem, subsequent to the attendance at that feast, and the departure from Bethany, after the raising of Lazarus; all that we are now concerned with is the length of the stay at Ephraim. St. John's expression, *κακεῖ διέτριβε*ⁿ, taken in any latitude we may please, cannot necessarily apply to more than one month's residence. In this case, our Lord would

ⁿ Ch. xi. 54.

leave Ephraim to return into Galilee, two months at least before the recurrence of the Passover, that is, about the end of January *; and there would still be sufficient time both for the mission and the return of the Seventy, and for his own subsequent circuit, made as proposed in their route. It can scarcely be doubted that, having dispatched the Seventy from some place or other, he must have waited there until their return; but as soon as they rejoined him that he must have set out directly. And hence, with nothing interposed after the account of their mission, except the mention of their return, we find him immediately after on his way himself.

Now though the place itself is not distinctly specified, yet enough has been said to prove that it must have been somewhere in Galilee; and if it was any quarter in Galilee, it is so likely to have been none as Capernaum. This circuit was the last, and so far if not the longest, it was yet the most important of all; and as every former circuit originally set out from Capernaum, it is reasonable to suppose that this in particular would do so. Capernaum was our Lord's place of abode; and if he had to wait for the return of the Seventy any where, he would most naturally wait for it in his usual home. His ministry in Galilee was begun by a circuit, which set out from thence; and it was only consistent that it should be closed also by a circuit, beginning from the same. The Twelve, as we have shewn was highly probable, were sent from Capernaum; and the same thing, *a priori*, was just as likely to be the case with the Seventy. Besides which, our Lord is expressly said to have set out *thence*°,

* The end of January would winter; the severity of which is be about the close of the Jewish over by January 20.

before he passed from Galilee into Peræa, and from Peræa into Judæa. And though no positive conclusion may be deducible from Luke x. 15, a part of the charge to the Seventy, preparatory to their departure, yet if those words were delivered *in* Capernaum and *on* the spot, it must be acknowledged they would lose nothing in point of force and propriety; but be wonderfully enhanced as to both.

If however our Lord really began his last circuit in Galilee, the probability that he would begin it from Capernaum is so great, that no one, who admits the former, will think of disputing the latter: and the former, in addition to what has been already said, allows of being directly and demonstratively proved, as follows:

I. On the morning of the crucifixion, the rulers of the Jews denounced our Saviour to Pilate in these words ^p; But they insisted, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Judæa, having *begun* from *Galilee*, ἐως ὁδε: in which there is evidently an accusation, grounded on the alleged tendency of the ministry of Jesus either for its whole course and duration in general, or for some portion of its course and duration in particular. It implies therefore either that the whole tenor of our Lord's public ministry, from first to last, had been to *stir up* the people, or that some part of it at least had been to that effect: and that this latter construction, not the former, is what was meant, appears from the language employed in ἐως ὁδε; describing not the continuance and discharge of a ministry, but the progress and direction of a circuit. The adverb ὁδε, throughout the New Testament, in which it occurs fifty or sixty times, is never once used except of place. The phrase ἐως ὁδε then can have no

^p Luke xxiii. 5.

meaning in this instance, but that of *unto here—as far as this place*.

Two extreme limits are consequently pointed out, one, Galilee, the other, Jerusalem; the former as that where the alleged conduct of our Saviour had first begun, the latter as that where it had ended; the former therefore denoting the place of the commencement of a circuit, the latter, the place of its termination; the period and course of the circuit in the mean time, as the Jews would have Pilate to believe, having been directed to this one purpose of going about, and stirring up the people. As it is certain then that our Lord's last journey ended at one of these extremes, Jerusalem, so upon the same authority, it must be supposed to have begun at the other, in Galilee. It must have been known to his accusers, when they advanced this charge against him, that on some recent occasion he had set out from Galilee, and had travelled gradually from place to place, teaching the people wheresoever he came, until at last he arrived in Jerusalem: it must have been known also that he had done this with so little secrecy or reserve; he had attracted so much notice; he had raised, and been attended by such numerous crowds; he had entered Jerusalem itself with so much publicity and state; that he might be said to have stirred up the people; to have agitated the public mind; and to have sown the seeds of tumult or disaffection wherever he had appeared.

The outward characteristics of our Lord's last progress were, unquestionably, such as to admit of a sinister construction: for knowing that this last journey was to terminate in his own death and passion; a death and a passion, which were to be transacted in the most conspicuous manner; he had as designedly courted publicity and observation upon this occasion,

as he had ever studied concealment before; and from the time of his setting out, to the time of his arrival in the city, he had taken care that both the world at large, and his enemies in particular, should have abundant opportunity of watching his movements, and of discovering, in his whole conduct and demeanour, the pregnant symptoms of some great and momentous event^p. It was the concourse and observation which his presence was producing at the time, to which we must ascribe the words of the Pharisees, Luke xiii. 31: and the proceedings, so minutely described, at the final entry into Jerusalem, are but indications of what had been going on, with more or less of the same pomp and celebrity, at every period of the progress previously. The passage through Jericho, in particular, is a case in point.

II. The women, who stood about our Saviour's cross, and were afterwards present at his interment, are described in general as women who had *followed him*, or, *come up with him from Galilee*; who had *followed Jesus from Galilee*, ministering unto him; who when he *was in Galilee followed him*, and ministered unto him; and had *come up with him unto Jerusalem*^q; and consequently upon this occasion, and in attendance upon this feast, which had brought them all alike up to Jerusalem—but after some journey, beginning in Galilee and ending in Jerusalem. And what is here asserted of the *female* disciples in our Saviour's train, St. Paul in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch asserts also of the male disciples in general, and of the Apostles in particular^r. The common progress therefore both of our Lord, and of his disciples of either sex, had been commenced in Galilee, before it was

^p Confer Theophylact, i. 230. C. In Marcum, xi. Matt. xxvii. 55. Mark xv. 41.

^r Acts xiii. 31.

^q Luke xxiii. 49. 55.

brought to a close in Jerusalem: and if so, nobody perhaps will doubt that it was begun from Capernaum. To proceed therefore.

The final end of dispatching the Seventy in thirty-five, or thirty-six companies, (as their number was seventy or seventy-two,) was evidently to facilitate the labours of each division, and so to expedite the common purpose of the ministry of all. By this means, each of these companies being engaged in as many different places at once, according to the special directions which they had each received; they could not be long in accomplishing their commission, and so returning to their Master. In the charge which was given to them before their departure^s, there is the same allusion to the shortness of the time for which they might expect to be absent, and to the dependence which they were to place on the providence of God for their support during their absence, as occurred in the former charge to the Twelve upon their mission also; but there is no allusion now, as there was then, to the possibility of a continued stay in particular places; there is no direction that, into whatsoever city or whatsoever house they might enter, *there* they should *abide*, and *thence* they should *depart*. The directions, which do occur, seem rather to intimate that they should stay long nowhere; that their appearance and their preaching in any quarter should partake of the nature of a passing visit.

We may conclude therefore that the errand of the Seventy would not be of long duration; and that Jesus might continue in Capernaum, or wherever else he was, without any memorable occurrence, until the time of their return. The mention indeed of this return^t, so instantly after the charge, is a presumptive

^s Ch. x. 2—16.

^t Ch. x. 17.

proof to the same effect. Nor when our Lord came to follow in their steps, is it necessary to suppose that he visited every place which they had visited before him; but simply that he visited himself no place which they had not visited before him, and that every place, which they had visited before him, lay somewhere upon the route in which he followed after them; so that all, who had heard the preaching of the Seventy, (which was doubtless the effect consulted by their mission,) might be prepared to expect, and be ready to resort to his own. It was not in fact possible that one man, however indefatigable his exertions, should singly travel over the same ground or perform the same work as thirty-five or thirty-six, except in a proportionably longer time; or by visiting in person not every place which they might have visited, but simply the principal places of that description, and by passing somewhere in the vicinity of the rest.

The first event recorded after the return is the question of the Lawyer, Luke x. 25: which must have happened while our Lord was teaching; and consequently in some private house, or in the synagogue. It might have happened therefore in Capernaum itself; and so have preceded the commencement of the circuit. But the next, that is, Christ's reception into the house of Martha^u—shews that he was actually on his journey, or that the circuit was now begun.

From this point to the time when he was certainly arrived in Judæa, there are clear internal evidences, scattered up and down the narrative, the united effect of all which is to determine the nature and character of the period, to which they alike belong, as one and the same; and that, the concluding period of our Lord's public ministry in general: and those parts of

^u Ib. 38.

the whole, concerning the chronological position of which there is commonly the greatest doubt, are the very parts, which upon examination supply these indications the most decidedly.

During all this period too there are, as we observed at the outset, similar intimations, beginning at Luke x. 38, when our Lord is first seen to be upon the road, and extending to xix. 1, when he is seen to have passed through Jericho; which all shew that he was journeying, and journeying in the direction of Jerusalem. There are others, not so direct, which nevertheless shew that he was journeying somewhither or other; and some, which shew as plainly as the more direct that he was journeying to Jerusalem.

For example, xi. 1, and xi. 14; at the former of which periods he was by himself; at the latter, in the company of the multitude: xiii. 10, and xiii. 32-35; from the last of which it is impossible to doubt whether he was both journeying at the time, and journeying expressly to Jerusalem, and very probably not far off from it, when he delivered those words: xiv. 1; as a different occasion, and consequently a different time and place, from those of the similar incident mentioned xi. 37: xiv. 25, xvii. 6; from the last of which we may conclude that Jesus was in Lower Galilee at the time. If the distinction, laid down by the rabbinical writers, is true, sycamine trees were to be found in Lower Galilee only; and where they first began to grow, discriminated Lower Galilee from Upper Galilee itself^v.

And with regard to the intimations of time or place, which are furnished by particular passages, in addition to those which have been already pointed out, I shall

^v Mishna, i. 189. 2. Reland, *Palæstina*. i. xlvii. 306. 1 Kings x. 27. 1 Chron. xxvii. 28.

shew hereafter that Luke x. 38–42, did not happen in Bethany, as it is commonly supposed, but in some village, most probably of Galilee, and certainly different from Bethany. I shall shew too that Luke xi. 14–36, is not to be confounded with Matt. xii. 22–45. If the substance also of Luke xi. 37–54, be compared with Matt. xxiii. throughout, which belongs beyond a question either to the Tuesday, or to the Wednesday in Passion-week, no person of moderate judgment will consider it probable that our Lord would provoke the hostility of this proud, inveterate, and influential sect, by so open and so sharp an attack, except at a time when he knew that it was no longer necessary to be careful about giving them offence; that is, until the conclusion of his ministry was arrived or not far distant.

What indications of the same fact are supplied by Luke xii. throughout, and by xiii. 1–9, will also appear hereafter. The discourse, which ensues xiii. 23–30, in answer to the question, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι, becomes much more significant and impressive, if the period of our Lord's ministry was then rapidly drawing to its close. But with regard to the rest of the chapter, from verse 31, downwards, referring to an incident which happened the same day; the mere perusal of the words must be sufficient to prove that Jesus was journeying at the time, and journeying to Jerusalem, on an occasion which would be followed by his death and passion. Go, and say to that fox, Behold, I am casting out devils, and I am performing healings, this day, and to-morrow; and the third day I am perfected: only I must journey this day, and to-morrow, and the next day; because it is not possible for a prophet to perish out of Jerusalem. What can be the meaning of this declaration, unless our Lord when he delivered

it was both going to Jerusalem, and by that unhappy necessity which rendered Jerusalem the destined scene of the destruction of the prophets, was going thither to perish? Every one at least will allow that it becomes, on this construction, wonderfully natural and apposite; a construction too, which has nothing to do with the further question in what sense the terms *to-day*, *to-morrow*, and the *next day** are to be understood. Whether these are literal notes of time or not, the drift of the answer remains the same; viz. that Jesus, however long he might be in travelling through the dominions of Herod, would yet be safe; because, being a prophet, he could not perish except in Jerusalem.

It will be admitted, also, that the pathetic apostrophe which follows, as it must have been produced by some association of ideas with what goes before, so would be as naturally produced by no association as by that of the idea of his approaching death. It must be evident likewise that the effort, which he was now making and still should make, to gather the children of Jerusalem together, was the *last* effort of the kind; upon the failure of which, their house should be left unto them desolate. Besides which, it is declared that they should not see him again until the time should come when they should say, Blessed is he, who is coming in the name of the Lord: a declaration, which a comparison with Matt. xxiii. 39, proves not to have been fulfilled merely when Jesus entered Jerusalem in triumph^w; but to belong to some period much later even than that. As *now* delivered, therefore, it was clearly *pro-*

* There may be an allusion in this number of days to the three years of his personal ministry.

^w Matt. xxi. 9.

leptically delivered; and if this present occasion of the journeying to Jerusalem was the last occasion of all, the *prolepsis* itself is naturally accounted for. For the whole journey, wheresoever it might have begun and wheresoever it might end, and whatsoever course it might take between, was still one occasion from first to last; directed to a single purpose, that of producing by a final effort the conversion and repentance of the Jews: at the end of which if it failed, and at any period of which if it was foreseen that it would fail, (both which things are true of the last circuit,) it might be said with an equal propriety, Ye shall see me no more again, as ye have seen me heretofore, until ye shall be prepared to say, Blessed is he, who is coming in the name of the Lord! Could it be said however with the same consistency at any time before the feast of Dedication; after which the Jews were to see our Lord on *three* several occasions, at least, making *three* several efforts for their conversion; first, at the feast of Dedication; secondly, at the raising of Lazarus; and thirdly, at the last Passover?

The address to the multitude, xiv. 26–35, argues the existence at the time of a more than usual expectation that his kingdom, such as they all anticipated, was at hand; the same expectation, which produced the question of the Pharisees, the ambitious petition of the sons of Zebedee, and the parable of the minæ^x; and gave occasion to that concourse of the people from all parts, and to that publicity of our Lord's motions and proceedings, alluded to before as characteristic of the last journey to Jerusalem in particular. Traces of the same peculiarity are perceptible also in the places noted below^y; during all which time Jesus was yet in Galilee,

^x Luke xvii. 20. Matt. xx. 20. Mark x. 35. Luke xix. 11. ^y Ch. xi. 14. 29. 53. xii. 1. 13. 54. xiii. 1. 14. 23. 24. 31. xiv. 25. xv. 1. xvi. 14.

or up to xviii. 30, (which Matt. xix. 29, 30, xx. 1, proves to have converged directly upon the parable of the labourers hired for the vineyard,) was still in *Pe-ræa*. Nor is the subject-matter of the prophecy, xvii. 20—xviii. 1–8, so readily accounted for on any principle, as on that of our Lord's speedy departure, and of its consequent speedy fulfilment by the event. A similar prophecy was afterwards delivered; but only on the last day of his appearance in public, and as a part of the discourse on Mount Olivet. Yet this there are Harmonists who assign to a period earlier than the feast of Dedication itself.

With so many internal evidences as these, all pointing distinctly to one and the same conclusion, both that of the unity and regularity of all this portion of St. Luke, and that of the time and place in the course of the Christian ministry, which it ought to be supposed to occupy; to doubt whether it belongs to the last six months of the Gospel-history, and to the last portion of those six months, or not, appears to me the perfection of scepticism and incredulity^z. I shall conclude therefore with the assumption of this point, as sufficiently proved; and confine the remainder of the present Dissertation to the consideration of the probable period when the three accounts, after having continued so long separated, may most justly be believed to coincide; and to go on in conjunction afresh.

The omission of these last six months, in the Gospel of St. Mark, is a natural consequence of their omission in the Gospel of St. Matthew; and their omission in the Gospel of St. Matthew may be accounted for on various grounds. First, a great part of the time was spent in Judæa; and in residing at Capernaum or at Ephraim;

^z Vide also vol. i. 26. 27. Dissertation i.

which St. Matthew either summarily supposes, or omits to notice only in common with St. Luke. Secondly, some portion more of it was occupied by the mission of the Seventy; an incident, both in its cause, in its design, and in its effect so similar to the previous mission of the Twelve, that one who had given a minute and particular account of the latter might well be excused from taking any notice of the former. Thirdly, even after our Lord's circuit in person was begun, a great part of its events, and consequently of what must have entered into a regular historical account of it, as it may be seen from St. Luke, consisted of matters which had transpired before, and been related by St. Matthew in their proper place previously. I do not mean that these were identical, which is far from being the case, but merely that they were similar; and consequently that, whether actions or discourses, there was no necessity, *a priori*, why they should be repeated by St. Matthew. On this subject however I refer the reader to my first Dissertation, in the preceding volume, p. 54.

It is a singular coincidence, however, that the precise point of time, at which St. Matthew and St. Mark do each resume the proper thread of their accounts, is with the passage of Jesus from Galilee into Peræa, as such. The renewal of his ministerial duties, and consequently their implicit suspension since the last return to Capernaum, (which was prior to the feast of Tabernacles,) is also specified at the same time; *καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ὥς εἰώθει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς*^a. This was in fact to resume the proper thread of the account as soon as the scene of our Saviour's ministry was become strictly speaking *new*, or could be said to have got upon ground not abso-

^a Mark x. 1.

lutely familiar to their Gospels : and such was the case when it had once passed into Peræa.

The time of this passage is intimated by Matt. xix. 1–2, and by Mark x. 1 ; the most likely position of both which, as it appears to me, is between Luke xvii. 19 and xvii. 20—xviii. 14. For at the time of the performance of the miracle upon the lepers, the exordium of the account shews that our Lord was still in Galilee ; and at the time of the subsequent discourses, wheresoever he was he was in some *one* place ; for all of them were consecutively delivered.

It is no difficulty, that St. Matthew says, He came εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου : that is, he came, on the other side of the Jordan, to the confines of Judæa : not as some commentators and writers on the geography of Palestine, have supposed—to the confines of Judæa beyond the Jordan ; as if there were a Judæa, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. The boundary of Judæa and of Peræa, in the vicinity of Jericho, was the Jordan ; and one, who had reached the Jordan in that direction on the eastern side, might truly be said to have come to the confines of Judæa on the western. St. Mark, however, as if on purpose to explain St. Matthew, expresses himself without ambiguity as follows : ἔρχεται Εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ΔΙΑ τοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου : on which no construction but one can possibly be put.

The plain of Jericho was seventy stades in length, and twenty in breadth : its chief productions being the palm and the balsam tree ^b ; as alluded to by Horace in this line,

Præferat Herodis palmetis pinguibus.

Epistolarum ii. ii. 184.

Its distance from Jerusalem was 150 stades, and

^b Bell. Jud. i. vi. 6. iv. viii. 3. Strabo, xvi. 2. §. 41. 367, 368. Cf. 4. §. 21. 442. Pliny, H. N. xiii. 9. Justin, xxxvi. 3.

from the banks of the Jordan 60^c: and the way from thence to Jerusalem was rocky, steep, and desert or solitary. The first indication that our Lord had now crossed the Jordan seems to be supplied at Matt. xx. 17-19, Mark x. 32-34, Luke xviii. 31-34: for both this prediction could never be so well timed, as when he was just entering Judæa; and the term ἀναβαίνωμεν, found in each of the accounts, must be some presumptive proof that they were upon the high-road between the Jordan and Jerusalem; which was really an *ascent*, especially after it had arrived at Jericho. The same locality was, therefore, the scene of the petition of the sons of Zebedee, and of the first miracle on the blind men; each before the entrance into Jericho.

It is probable, consequently, that Jesus was arrived at the borders of Judæa, or within a day's journey of being so, when the Pharisees put their question concerning divorce^d; especially as it may be made to appear, that this question was put just before he withdrew into some private house; and that the next incident recorded, but one, the application of the rich young ruler, followed in its consequences by the parable of the labourers, took place as he was coming out εἰς ὁδόν; which means in resumption of his journey. The scene of this parable was probably Peræa; and the time as probably was morning. For Peræa, which was rich in vineyards^e; not the plain of Jericho, where none were planted; was much the most likely to suggest the parable on the spot: and the time of the parable itself is laid in the spring of the year, and on the morning of some day: both which things would also be true of our Saviour's journey, if he was now only

^c Bell. Jud. iv. viii. 3. Ant. Jud. v. i. 4.

^d Matt. xix. 3. Mark x. 2.

^e Bell. Jud. iii. iii. 3.

one day's journey distant from Jerusalem, and preparing to renew his progress ἀμὰ πρωῒ, that is, with sunrise in the day.

I infer, then, that the question of the Pharisees was put towards the close of *one* day; and that the proceedings of *another* are specified with the resumption of the journey, and the application of the ruler directly after. If our Saviour was at this very time at the ford of Bethabara, only 210 stades distant from Jerusalem, or even further off, I shall shew hereafter that by setting out in the morning, at the ordinary time of commencing a journey in the East, and travelling leisurely at the rate of only two or three miles to the hour, he might yet pass through Jericho, and stop with Zaccheus before the ninth hour of the day; within three or four Roman miles of Jerusalem. I shall shew also that this was the Friday before Passion-week; one day before he actually arrived at Bethany, and seven days or exactly one week, before he suffered.

DISSERTATION XXXII.

On the village of Martha and Mary.

THAT the scene of the incident, which is recorded Luke x. 38–42, was some village of Galilee, the name of which, because it was altogether unnecessary to mention, the Gospel narrative has left indefinite, appears to me so certain a point, that I know not how it can reasonably be questioned; nor is there a stronger proof of the implicit submission, with which opinions have been handed down from one commentator to another, as if prescriptively entitled to reception; than the very ancient and very general mistake, which has hitherto confounded it with Bethany.

Had the village been really Bethany, there is no conceivable reason why St. Luke should have suppressed its name; and those, who can be content with the reason which is commonly assigned for this omission, might be content with any thing. Nor is such an omission more improbable in itself, than contrary to the usage of the Evangelist; especially in what, upon this principle, must have been the first instance of the occurrence of the name in his Gospel. With regard to the designations of places generally, throughout the Gospels, this rule may be observed to hold good; that, among a vast number of πόλεις and κῶμαι, little short of a thousand, which might have been mentioned, though the names of what are called *cities* are sometimes specified, those of towns or villages (including every thing below the rank or population of a city); all bearing appellations of Jewish etymon, which to any but natives would seem barbarous and uncouth in their structure; appellations consequently proportionably difficult to express in-

telligibly in Greek ; never are. To this rule, the villages of Bethany and of Bethphage, both in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, both upon the high road from Jericho over the mount of Olives, and both memorable for some of the most interesting particulars in the Gospel-history ; were as likely to be exceptions as any : and as they are, one or other of them, specified by name in all the Gospels, thrice by St. Matthew, five times by St. Mark, thrice by St. Luke, and thrice by St. John ; it is manifest that they are exceptions.

The origin of the mistake may be traced up to these two assumptions : first, that Martha and Mary were the sisters of Lazarus ; secondly, that Lazarus, and consequently they also were natives of Bethany. The former of these I am not disposed to question ; but of the latter, there is good reason to doubt : and even were it true, still it would not justify the inference grounded upon it. A native and much more a mere inhabitant of Bethany might yet have possessions in Galilee.

But the antecedent probability is altogether in favour of the presumption that the family of Lazarus were natives of Galilee. All our Lord's followers, and especially the chief and the most devoted among them, the Twelve, the Seventy, the one hundred and twenty on the day of Pentecost ; every female disciple in particular, Mary of Magdala, Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome, Susanna, Johanna, the wife of Chuzas : as it may be concluded with an assurance almost amounting to certainty, were natives of Galilee, and none of them of Judæa. And as to this one family, however doubtful it might be concerning the rest, I think it may be shewn even upon the testimony of St. John himself, that though all or some of them might be resident at Bethany, they were not born

there; and consequently must have been natives of some other part; which part we may reasonably suppose was Galilee.

St. John has a singular idiom, affecting the use of the prepositions ἀπὸ and ἐξ; of which this is an instance ^a: ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαιῶν, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου. The sense of the preposition ἀπὸ is not the same with that of the preposition ἐξ; and consequently the phrase ἀπὸ Βηθσαιῶν, strictly rendered, cannot be identical with the phrase ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου, strictly rendered also. The natural sense of ἀπὸ, as thus employed, is to designate an *inhabitant*, and the corresponding sense of ἐκ, similarly employed, is to specify a *native* of a particular place. The former would answer to our vernacular use of, *of*; the latter we have no means of expressing by a corresponding preposition, nor by any thing but a periphrasis. That the former is thus used in the present instance no one will dispute; or if they shall, it may be proved by a reference to parallel places—τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαιῶν—Ἰωσήφ, ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας—ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ^b—in all which it stands to denote an *inhabitant* of one of those places. Philip therefore, ὁ ἀπὸ Βηθσαιῶν, means Philip who was *of* Bethsaida; that is, Philip who was an inhabitant of Bethsaida; and how different this would be from Philip ὁ ἐκ Βηθσαιῶν will appear from the following considerations:

I. The phrase, Ἰησοῦς, ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, to express the quarter which our Saviour was known to be *of*, is of standing occurrence in all the Gospels ^{* c}; the phrase,

* So Virgil, Georgica, iii. 2: Pastor ab Amphryso.

^a Ch. i. 45. ^b John xii. 21. xix. 38. xxi. 2. Compare also, Matt. xv. 1. xxvii. 57. Mark xv. 43. Luke xxiii. 51. John vii. 42. Acts vi. 9. x. 23. xxi. 10. 27. xxiv. 18. xxv. 7. ^c Matt. xxi. 11. Mark i. 9. John i. 46. Acts x. 38.

Ἰησοῦς, ὁ ἐκ Ναζαρέτ, is never once to be met with in any of them; and for a good reason: because it would have asserted a falsehood. A person, who had been both born and bred up at Nazareth, might well be said to be ἀπὸ and ἐκ Ναζαρέτ; but one, who had not been born there, though he might have lived from his birth and been brought up there, never could be said to be ἐκ Ναζαρέτ: only ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ. Nor can the distinct and proper force of these two modes of designation respectively be better illustrated, than by the instance which follows upon John i. 45 itself. Philip, after conversing with Jesus, is said to have found Nathanael, and to have addressed him thus: We have found him, of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets have written—Jesus, the son of Joseph, τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ: which described our Lord merely by the place of his residence as such. But Nathanael, concluding that the place of his residence must have been the place of his birth, expresses his surprise accordingly; ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ^d;

II. Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; οὐχὶ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ, καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλεέμ, τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαβὶδ, ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται ^e; The use of ἐξ, in the first of these questions, is to describe a native of Galilee; and in the second to designate a lineal descendant of David: but the use of ἀπὸ, in the words ἀπὸ Βηθλεέμ, is not to specify a *native*, but merely one *of*, that is, an *inhabitant* of Bethlehem. This may be made to appear, first by a comparison with vii. 27, before: τοῦτον οἶδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν. If the words, πόθεν ἐστίν, in this last assertion, are to be un-

^d Vide also, Matt. i. 20. ii. 6. Luke i. 5. 27. ii. 4. 36. v. 17. xxiii. 7. John iv. 7. 22. 39. vii. 52. viii. 23. Many more examples might be produced.
^e John vii. 41, 42.

derstood of the *family* of the Christ, they would be contradictory to what was afterwards asserted; viz. that he should be of the seed of David. And if they are not to be understood of the *family* of the Christ, they must be understood of the *place* of his *birth*. It was known that the Christ should be *of* the seed of David: it was not known *where* he should be born. They cannot refer even to the place where he should appear; for then they would contradict another part of the subsequent assertion; which affirmed that he should be *of* Bethlehem. Here it is said, that when the Christ came, it should not be known *whence* he was; there it is said to be known already that he should be *of* Bethlehem: and these assertions would still be consistent, if the former referred to the place of his birth, the latter to the place of his residence: and both, prior to his appearance as the Christ.

Secondly, there are passages in Justin Martyr, which critically accord to this hypothesis; shewing that the Jews in his time, and by parity of reason in our Saviour's time so little before his, entertained such an idea about the Messiah, as might naturally induce them to think that he would be manifested at Bethlehem, but not necessarily that he would be born there. Χριστὸς δὲ, εἰ καὶ γεγέννηται καὶ ἔστι πον, ἄγνωστός ἐστι, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται, οὐδὲ ἔχει δυνάμιν τινα, μέχρῃς ἂν ἐλθὼν Ἡλίας κρίσῃ αὐτὸν, καὶ φανερόν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ—Καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι, καὶ τὸν Ἡλίαν κρίσαι αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα—And again, where Justin himself is speaking; Καὶ αὐτὸν ὅτι οὐδέπω φασὶν ἐληλυθέναι, καὶ τοῦτο γινώσκω· εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐληλυθέναι λέγουσιν, οὐ γινώσκεται ὅς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμφανῆς καὶ ἐνδοξος γένηται, τότε γνωσθήσεται ὅς ἐστι, φασί^f.

^f Dialogus, 153. l. 26—31 : 235. l. 15—18 : 371. l. 4—9.

They who believed these things, could not possibly expect the Christ to be born at any particular place, though they might perhaps expect him to be manifested at some such place. The phrase too, $\delta\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta\ \hat{\eta}\nu$, not $\delta\theta\epsilon\nu \Delta\alpha\beta\acute{\iota}\delta\ \hat{\eta}\nu$, is more in accordance with this supposition, than with the other; implying that the Christ should be *at*, or *of* Bethlehem, when Elias should anoint him; as David was, when he was anointed by Samuel. Nor does Matt. ii. 4–6, present any difficulty; since they, who returned that answer to Herod, could not have entertained this opinion, nor any opinion like this concerning the Christ; but must have had truer and better apprehensions of him. Nor are we considering the rectitude of opinions, but the use of terms; according to which, $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\nu \epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$, in the one instance, and $\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\ \text{Βηθ-}\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\mu$, in the other, if they are not to assert contradictions, must imply different things. To return then from this digression.

In our original proposition, $\Phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\iota\pi\pi\omicron\varsigma \alpha\pi\omicron\delta\ \text{Βηθσαιδ}\acute{\alpha}$, $\epsilon\kappa\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \text{Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου}$, if the use of $\alpha\pi\omicron\delta$, in the first member, is to describe an *inhabitant* of Bethsaida, the use of $\epsilon\zeta$, in the second, cannot be to do the same thing: for that would make Philip and Andrew and Peter all of them inhabitants of Bethsaida. But though this might be the case with Philip, it would be false of Andrew and Peter; whom Mark i. 21. 29, Luke iv. 31. 38, demonstrate to have been inhabitants of Capernaum. If however the use of $\epsilon\zeta$ is not to designate an inhabitant, it must be to describe a native of the same city with Andrew and Peter; and the proposition will affirm either that Philip and Andrew and Peter had all been born at Bethsaida, where Philip had lived ever since; or that Philip and Andrew and Peter had all been born in Capernaum, where Andrew and Peter had lived ever since, though Philip had set-

tled in Bethsaida. Now this is by far the most probable supposition ; for ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου never can be merely synonymous with ἀπὸ Βηθσαιᾶ ; which it must be on the contrary supposition : and Peter and Andrew, both settled in Capernaum, (and the former of them even married there,) and both in partnership with two other inhabitants of the place, it is highly reasonable to conclude must each have been born and brought up there. In any case, while the ἀπὸ is still to be distinguished from the ἐκ, neither of them can be dropped, as in the received translation ; nor the latter rendered, except by a periphrasis, as follows : Now Philip was *of* Bethsaida—but *a native* of the city of Andrew and Peter : *this* circumstance being specified in contradistinction to *that*, in all probability to account for some acquaintance between themselves, before any of them became acquainted with Jesus.

I have been the more particular in explanation of this idiom, because John xi. 1, at the outset of the history of Lazarus, is exactly a parallel construction to it : ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας, καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς : which we shall now understand accordingly : There was a certain person sick, Lazarus, who was of Bethany ; a native of the village of Mary, and of Martha her sister. The name of Lazarus, which occurs no where in the Gospels except in St. John, and no where in St. John before this passage, is here introduced to the reader, as the name of a stranger naturally would be, first, indefinitely—There was one Lazarus ; secondly, with such additional particulars, as might contribute to make him better known ; one, his being of Bethany, another, his belonging to the village of Mary and her sister Martha.

Now by this reference to the village of Mary and her sister Martha, it is indisputably clear in my opinion

that St. John refers to this present account of St. Luke ; which speaks of a certain κώμη or village ; of two sisters, Martha and Mary belonging to it ; and of something, affecting the personal history of them both, which transpired in it. Out of the Gospel of St. Luke, if we except what follows from the xith to the xiith of St. John, no such persons, nor any such allusions to their history, are to be met with ; nor, in the Gospel of St. Luke itself, in any passage but the present.

And as St. John expected to make Lazarus better known, by referring to the village of Martha and Mary, whose brother he was ; so he expected to make Mary better known, by referring to the performance of a memorable act, mentioned indeed by St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not ascribed to any one by name ; the unction of our Lord at Bethany ; which unction he tells us was the act of Mary, the sister of this Lazarus, who was sick : and in this statement I think it must be admitted that he refers as plainly to St. Matthew or to St. Mark, as in the former instance he did to St. Luke.

This part then of the Gospel of St. John, compared with St. Luke's, places it beyond a question that the Martha and the Mary of St. Luke were the two sisters of Lazarus ; which otherwise could not have been inferred for certain. But it proves also that as Lazarus was not a native of Bethany, so neither was either of them ; and therefore that the village to which they all belonged, might still be some village in Galilee ; and certainly was not one of Judæa, near to Jerusalem. The history of the unction too which he afterwards records, compared in like manner with the account of St. Matthew or St. Mark, enables us to resolve the remaining problem ; If the family of Lazarus were not natives of Bethany, how came any part or all of them to be living there ?

The supper, which was made for our Saviour, on the night of his arrival at Bethany, took place in the house of Martha; as may be inferred for the following reasons: I. Because it was manifestly intended out of gratitude for the recent miracle in behalf of Lazarus. II. Because Lazarus, her brother, was one of the guests. III. Because Martha herself ministered or waited; which she never could or never would have done, in any house but her own: and Theophylact reasons upon this fact accordingly. *Διὰ δὲ τοῦ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει, ἐσήμανεν ὅτι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτῆς ἡ ἐστίασις ἦν**g. IV. Because Mary, the sister of Martha, anointed our Lord, on the same occasion, as he sat at meat. This act being judged of by a reference to the usages of the time could properly be the act of no one, except either the owner of the house, or one who stood in some near relation to him: for it was designed on purpose to do honour to their guest, and (though by no means an unusual instance of respect) it was as striking as any which could have been employed. And this circumstance alone (if there were no other reason to the same effect) would be sufficient to discriminate the present unction by Mary in St. John, from the former unction recorded by St. Luke^h; viz. that Mary's unction was entirely an expression of personal compliment, and for the sake of the patient; St. Luke's, an expression of penitence, and for the sake of the agent: Mary's had no object except to do honour to our Saviour, and to declare the two sisters' respect for their guest, or their gratitude to the preserver of their brother; St. Luke's was an earnest of the woman's contri-

* Et tantum venerata virum atque epulas ipsa ministra gerat.
hunc sedula curet, | Huic paret Tibullus i. v. 33.

g Operum i. 669. B. Comm. in Joh. xii.

h Ch. vii. 37—end.

tion, a declaration that she believed our Saviour could forgive her sins, and only a more humble mode of entreating that he would.

The entertainment then, according to St. John, was doubtless given in the house of Martha. But according to St. Matthew and St. Markⁱ, it was given in the house of Simon, surnamed the Leper. If both these representations are true, it was given in the house of both; and consequently either what Theophylact asserts of the tradition concerning Simon : τὸν δὲ Σίμωνα τοῦτον τὸν Λεπρόν φασὶ τινες καὶ πατέρα εἶναι τοῦ Λαζάρου^k: that he was the father of Lazarus, and therefore of Martha, becomes true of the relation between them; or what is much more probable, Simon was the *husband* of Martha, and either of them might be called indifferently the owner of the house.

As he is called the Leper, we must needs suppose that he had once been such; though we cannot suppose that he was so still. Hence it is probable that our Saviour had cured him of his leprosy; and if he was the husband of Martha, that would be a sufficient foundation of the faith of himself and of his family in Christ; a faith, prior to the time of the subsequent miracle, and therefore not produced, however much it might be strengthened by it. Now Simon himself it is possible might be a native of Bethany, and yet notwithstanding be married to a native of Galilee; and consequently to one who might have possessions in Galilee. And if Martha, who seems to have been the oldest of the family of Lazarus, was married to a native of Bethany, it is nothing extraordinary that her sister and brother, both of them younger than herself, and all three united together by the closest and ten-

ⁱ Matt. xxvi. 6. Mark xiv. 3.
xxvi.

^k Operum i. 143. A. In Matt.

derest ties of attachment, should be permanently resident there also with her; yet so as occasionally to visit Galilee. It was a maxim of Jewish law, *Maritus non habet ullam possessionem in bonis uxoris suæ, nec uxor in bonis mariti*: it was another maxim, *Filii, filiaque, jus idem est in hæreditate*¹. The first born received a double portion; the rest, of either sex, shared alike. This maxim therefore proves that Martha might have property of her own, though she had a brother, a sister, and an husband, all alive at the same time: the former proves in like manner that our Lord might as properly be said to be entertained in *her house* in Galilee, as in Simon's at Bethany.

When Jesus quitted Jerusalem to retire to Ephraim, the family of Lazarus might leave its vicinity also; for after his resurrection the safety of Lazarus was as much endangered by a personal continuance in Bethany, as our Lord's. And this conjecture, I think, is so far confirmed by the course of the subsequent history that, from John xii. 9–11, we may safely conclude Lazarus had not been in the neighbourhood any more than Jesus, since the time of that miracle, until they both appeared there again, six days before the last Passover. It is possible that, when our Lord retired to Ephraim, the two sisters at least removed to Galilee; and knowing that Jesus was shortly to make his final circuit of that country, preparatory to visiting Jerusalem, that they purposely awaited his arrival in their native village; and after entertaining him there accompanied him upon the rest of his journey. These therefore may be intended among others, as persons who had recently come up with him from Galilee^m; and who, even in that country, had followed after and ministered unto him.

¹ Mishna, iv. 169. 3: 191. 5. ^m Matt. xxvii. 55. Mark xv. 41. Luke xxiii. 49. 55.

I cannot do better then than conclude this Dissertation with some general observations.

I. Though Lazarus also had accompanied his sisters into Galilee, there would still be no reason to suppose that his name would be mentioned by St. Luke, in the account of an incident which had nothing at all to do with him. What, therefore, Epiphaniusⁿ asserts, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν παραδόσεσιν εὐρομεν ὅτι τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἦν τότε ὁ Λάζαρος, ὅτε ἐγγήγερται, μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν, ἄλλα τριάκοντα ἔτη ἔζησε, may be true or may be false, or partly the one and partly the other; but it cannot, in the slightest degree, apply to the case in point. The silence of St. Luke about Lazarus here would be a natural consequence, even though he had related his resurrection elsewhere.

II. I have assumed that our Lord was now on his last progress; journeying from place to place, and consequently stopping only for the purpose of necessary refreshment, or of the discharge of the duties of his ministry, or of both. The circumstances of this history prove all these things; his entering into a certain village, as he was on the road somewhither; his being entertained and his teaching both, in a certain house: and therefore they are all in perfect consistency with the supposition of a circuit already begun, and still going on; but not yet complete, much less concluded by the arrival of Jesus at Jerusalem.

III. Among the circumstances of peculiarity, which characterised the unction at Bethany, two only require any particular illustration; one, the supposed value of the unguent in proportion to its quantity, the other, the peculiarity of the denomination which is given to it.

The quantity of the unguent was an alabaster box

ⁿ Adversus Hæreses, i. 652. B. Manichæi, xxxiv.

or vase full, estimated at a pound in weight; the propriety of which estimation is explained by the following passage from Epiphanius^o; ἀλάβαστρον μύρου βικίον μὲν ἐστὶν ὑέλινον, χωροῦν λίτραν ἐλαίου· τὸ δὲ μέτρον ἐστὶ ξέστου τὸ ἥμισυ. ἀλάβαστρον δὲ κέκληται διὰ τὸ εὐθρυπτον. Boxes of this material were especially appropriated to the reception of unguents*. Ἡ πονηρὰ γὰρ φθορὰ, καθάπερ τῶν οἴνων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χυλῶν τὸ οἰκείον ἀφαιρεῖ θερμόν· διὸ καὶ εἰς ἀγγεῖα μολυβδᾶ ἐγγέουσιν, καὶ τοὺς ἀλαβάστρους ζητοῦσι τοιούτου λίθου· ψυχρὸν γὰρ καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ ὁ μόλυβδος, καὶ ὁ λίθος ὁ τοιοῦτος, καὶ ἄριστος τοῖς μύροις ὁ μάλιστα τοιοῦτος^p. Unguenta optime servantur in alabastris, odores in oleo—Hunc aliqui lapidem alabastriten vocant, quem cavant ad vasa unguentaria; quoniam optime servare incorrupta dicitur^q. Ἀλάβαστρον, ἄγγος μύρου, μὴ ἔχον λαβὰς, λίθινον^r.

* In shape, the alabaster vase was round, and tapering from the bottom to the top: whence Pliny, Alabastrorum figura, in pleniorē orbem desinentes—Quo mox intumescēte, et in virides alabastrōs fastigato^s. Clemens Alexandrinus gives the name of alabasters to a species of drinking vessel, or glass, with a narrow, probably a tapering, orifice; which he appears to recommend as fittest for the female sex to drink out of^t. Alabaster vases were kept in cases called ἀλαβαστροθήκαι, which were usually painted in some manner or other. Demosthenes reproaches the brother of Æschines with mak-

ing this once his trade or profession: σὲ μὲν τὰς ἀλαβαστροθήκας γράφοντα καὶ τὰ τύμπανα^u. Harpocration: ἀλαβαστροθήκαι· αἱ θῆκαι τῶν ἀλαβάστων, ἃς ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ μυροθήκας καλοῦσιν... ἀλάβαστοι δ' εἰσι λήκυθοι ὧν οὐκ ἔστι λαβέσθαι διὰ λειότητα. Cf. Pollux, Onomasticon, vii. cap. 33. §. 6. Also, vi. cap. 19. and x. cap. 26. And Suidas, in Ἀλαβαστροθήκας and Λήκυθον.

Sometimes the receptacles of unguents were conchs or shells, if they happened to be naturally set or strung with pearls. Coherentes vidimus (sc. margaritas), observes Pliny, in conchis, hac dote unguenta circumferen-

^o Operum ii. 182. B. De Mensuris et Ponderibus.

^p Theophrastus, περὶ ὀσμῶν 449, ad caput paginæ. ^q Pliny, H. N. xiii. 3. xxxvi. 12. ^r Suidas, Ἀλάβαστρον. Vide also Pollucis Onomasticon, vi. 19. Another name for it was ἐξάλειπτρον. See Suidas, Ἐξάλειπτρον, and the Scholia, ad Aristophan. Acharnenses, 1062. Also, μυράλειπτρον. See Suidas, in Ἐπαύλια.

^s H. N. ix. 56. xxi. 10.

^t Operum i. 186. l. 26: Pædagogus, ii. 2: also Ibid. 187. 4.

^u Oratio xix. §. 262.

περὶ δ' ἐμῷ κάρᾳ
 πληγείσ' ἐνανάγησεν ὀστρακουμένη,
 χωρὶς μυρηρῶν τευχέων πνέουσ' ἐμοί.

Æschyli Fragm. apud Athenæum, i. 30.

ἄλλος δ' εὐώδες μύρον ἐν φιάλῃ παρατείνει·

κρατὴρ δ' ἔστηκεν μεστὸς εὐφροσύνης.

Xenophanes, apud Athenæum, xi. 7.

τὰς ταινίας οἱ Χαλκιδεῖς,

καὶ τοὺς ἀλαβάστους, συμβολὰς καλοῦσι, γραῦ.

Alexis, Ibid. viii. 68.

ὦ ἴτ' Ἀχαιῖδες· καὶ μὴ μύρα μῆδ' ἀλαβάστρως·

συρίγγων αἶψ φθόγγον ὑπαξονίων·

μὴ μύρα λωτροχόοι τᾷ Παλλάδι, μῆδ' ἀλαβάστρως·

οὐ γὰρ Ἀθαναία χρίματα μικτὰ φιλεῖ·

οἴσετε, μῆδὲ κάτοπτρον· αἰεὶ καλὸν ὄμμα τὸ τήνας.

Callimachus, In Lavacrum Palladis, 13.

εἵριά τε ῥοδόεντα καὶ ἐς κυανότριχα χαίτην

νάρδον, ὑπὸ γλαυκῆς κλειομένην ὕαλου.

ὄφρα χιτῶν μὲν χρώτα περισκέπη· ἔργα δ' ἐλέγχῃ

χεῖρας· ὁ δ' εὐώδης ἀτμὸς ἔχῃ πλοκάμους.

Anthologia, ii. 155. Antiphili vi w.

ἔπειτ' ἀλάβαστος εὐθέως ἦξει μύρον.

Athenæus, vi. 94.

οὐ γὰρ ἐμυρίζετ' ἐξ ἀλαβάστου, πρᾶγμα τι

γινόμενον αἰεὶ, Κρονικόν.

Ibid. xv. 44.

Nunc vos, optato quas junxit lumine tæda,

Non prius unanimis corpora conjugibus

Tradite, nudantes rejecta veste papillas,

Quam jucunda mihi munera libet onyx :

Vester onyx, casto colitis quæ jura cubili.

Catullus, lxvi. De Coma Berenices, 79.

Quod quacunque venis, Cosmum * migrare putamus,

Et fluere excusso cinnama fusa vitro,

Nolo peregrinis placeas tibi, Gellia, nugis.

Martial, iii. 55.

tibus v. Horace, Oblivioso levia
 Massico | Ciboria exple: funde
 capacibus | Unguenta de con-
 chis &c. Carm. ii. vii. 21.

* Cosmus was the name of
 some celebrated perfumer in

Juvenal's or Martial's time, or
 else some one, notorious for his
 passionate love of ointments.
 Cœnet licet ostrea centum |
 Gaurana, et Cosmi toto merga-
 tur aëno. Juvenal, viii. 85.

v Pliny, H. N. ix. 54.

w Cf. Suidas, Μνιαρὸν et Νάρδος.

Unguentum fuerat, quod onyx modo parva gerebat ;

Olfecit postquam Papilus, ecce garum est.

Ibid. vii. 94.

Nunc furtiva lucri fieri bombycina possunt,

Profertur Cosmi nunc mihi siccus onyx.

Ibid. xi. 50. 5.

Quibus etiam alabaster plenus unguenti putere videatur^s—Περιενεγκόντων δὲ τῶν παίδων ἐν ἀλαβάστροις, καὶ ἄλλοις χρυσοῖς σκεύεσι μύρα^t—Data et vasa aurea, cum unguentis, ad speciem alabastrorum^u—'Ανθ' ᾧ ἡ θεὸς ἔδωκεν ἀλάβαστρον αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶχεν αὐτὴ μύρον^v—'Ρέουσι δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐλαίου σταγόνες, οὓς ἐρίψῃ ἀναψώντες ἀπὸ τοῦ δένδρου ἀποπιέζουσιν εἰς ἀλαβάστρους λιθίνους^w.

The price of the unguent is computed, both in St. Mark and in St. John, at three hundred pence, denarii or drachmæ, or at more than that sum ; which would amount to between nine and ten pounds of English money : that is to say, the unguent was valued at almost one pound *per* ounce. There can be no question, however, that it was of a rich and costly description ; in which case a pound's weight of it, as we shall see, might be worth that price or more. The name of μύρον νάρδιον was given to a species of unguent composed of a variety of sweet spices, besides the nard. Syrian unguents (of which this in St. John was probably one) were reckoned the most excellent in general^x ; and the trade in unguents was so exclusively confined to Syrian or Phœnician dealers^y, that, according to Juvenal, Syrophœnix was but another name for an *unguentarius*, or vender of unguents.

Obvius assiduo Syrophœnix * udus amomo

Currit, Idumææ Syrophœnix incola portæ. Sat. viii. 159.

* This term illustrates the *μισσα*, as applied to the woman propriety of St. Mark's Συροφοί- of Canaan, vii. 26. Eunapius,

^s Cicero, Academicorum ii. ap. Nonium Marc.

Cf. iv. 3. ^u Capitolinus, Verus Imp. 5.

Cf. Servius ad Æneid. iii. 279.

p. 49. l. 34. *ad sinistram*.

Expositio Alex. vi. 22.

^t Athenæus, xv. 34.

^v Ælian, Variæ Hist. xii. 18.

^w Ctesia Indica, apud Photium, Cod. 72.

^x Athenæus, xv. 38.

^y Vide Arrian,

... Συρίῳ δὲ μύρῳ χρύσει' ἀλάβαστρα.

Theocritus, xv. 114.

οὐ σμύρνης καὶ Συρίας ὁδμαί.

Athenæus, iv. 7.

ἡλείφετο

ἐκ τῆς Συρίας ἦκοντι τοιούτῳ * μύρῳ
καρποῦ, συχνόν γ'· οὐ† φασι τὰς περισσότερὰς
τρώγειν.

Ibid. vi. 71.

ὥς δέ τις ἡθιέων, ὑπὸ νυμφοκόμοισι γυναιξὶν
εἵμασιν ἀργεννοῖσι καὶ ἄνθεσι πορφυρέοισι
στεψάμενος, πνείων τε Παλαιστίνιοιο μύροιο,
ἐς θάλαμον βαίνησιν, ὑμῆν, ὑμέναιοι ἀείδων.

Oppian, Cynegeticæ i. 337.

Nec tamen illa mihi dextra deducta paterna

Fragrantem Assyrio venit odore domum.

Catullus, lxxviii. 143.

Non thalamus Tyrio fragrans accepit amomo,

Nullæ illam sedes.

Virgil, Ciris, 512.

Quod Cilicum flores, quod munera graminis Indi,

Quodque Arabes, Phariique, Palæstinique liquores

Arsuram lavere comam?

Statius, Silvarum, ii. i. 160.

Καὶ ὁπότε ἦκον ἐκ Συρίας, ἀλάβαστρον μύρον ἐκ Φοινίκης^z.

Among the Syrian themselves none was more esteemed than the nardine.

μέλλει τε συνθείς σοι φέρειν

τὰ κιννάμωμα ταῦτα καὶ τὰ νάρδινα.

Athenæus, xv. 40.

ἡδὺ τὸ μύρον, παῖ (παιδίον) πῶς γὰρ οὐχί; (οὐ) νάρδιον†.

Ibid. 42.

De folio nardi, observes Pliny, plura dici par est, ut principali in unguentis: and again, In nostro orbe proxime laudatur Syriacum, mox Gallicum, tertio loco Creticum^a.

indeed, De Vitis Sophistarum, Libanius, 98, 99, gives the name of *Συροφοίνικες* to all the inhabitants of Cœle Syria, vide p. 96, natives of Antioch as well as the rest. But Juvenal's and St. Mark's appellation is more strictly appropriate, as used by them.

* Forsan τοιούτον.

† Ita legendum.

‡ According to Schweighæuser, the above quotation from Menander stands thus: ἡδὺ τὸ μύρον γ' ὃ παιδίον, ἡδύ. πῶς γὰρ οὐ; | νάρδιον.

Tunc me vina juvent, nardo confusa rosisque :
Sertaque et unguentis sordida facta coma.

Asinius Cornelius Gallus, 91.

Illius puro destillent tempora nardo ;
Atque satur libo sit, madeatque mero.

Tibullus, ii. ii. 7.

Nardo perunctum, quale non perfectius
Meæ laborarint manus. Horace, Epodœon v. 59.

Nunc et Achæmenio

Perfundi nardo juvat, et fide Cyllenea
Levare diris pectora solitudinibus. Ibid. xiii. 8.

Πέντε μὲν τὰς πρώτας ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ πάντες ἐκ χρυσῶν
ὀλκίων ἡλείφοντο κροκίνῳ μύρῳ· ἦν δὲ ταῦτα πεντεκαίδεκα·
καὶ κινναμωμίνου τὰ ἴσα, καὶ ναρδίνου^a—Ἐπιτηδεύουσι δὲ καὶ
τὸ ἀπὸ κρίνων μύρον· καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κύπρου· καὶ ἡ νάρδος
εὐδοκιμεῖ παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ρόδων ἄλειμμα^b.
κ', τ. λ.

Now even the spikenard, unprepared, was worth an hundred denarii a pound^c; and the same substance after all the trouble and loss sustained in the preparation of the ointment might easily fetch three times that sum. Athenæus asserts^d that a cotyla of unguent, the content of which measure like the alabaster vase full must be reckoned, according to Arbuthnot, at half the ζέστης or pint; was sold at Athens for five minæ, or five hundred drachmæ; almost sixteen pounds English: and even at twice that sum. A sextarius or pint of balm of Gilead, opobalsamum, was commonly sold in the time of Pliny, by the retail dealers, for one thousand denarii, and at the custom house itself, for three hundred^e: to which unguent Juvenal alludes in these lines;

Sed tamen unde

Hæc emis, hirsuto spirant opobalsama collo
Quæ tibi? ne pudeat dominum monstrare tabernæ. ii. 40.

^a Polybius, De Antiocho Epiphane, apud Athenæum, v. 24.
Alex. i. 207. l. 16. Pædagogus, ii. 8. ^c Pliny, H. N. xii. 26.

^b Clemens
d xv. 44.

^e H. N. xii. 54.

Theophrastus also tells us that Balsam pure, in his own time, was worth twice its weight in money: *πωλείσθαι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἄκρατον δις πρὸς ἀργύριον τὸ δ' ἄλλο κατὰ λόγον τῆς μίξεως*^f. One of the old comedians, Antiphanes, writes thus:

στακτὴ δνοῖν μναῖν οὐκ ἀρέσκει μ' οὐδαμῶς.

Athenæus, xv. 44.

and Pliny mentions an unguent obtained from the *malobathrum*, a Syrian shrub, which he describes as yielding an oil like that of the nard, the common price of which, when the best of its kind, was 300 denarii to the pound *℥*. It is to this that Horace refers,

Coronatus nitentes

Malobathro Syrio capillos.

Carminum ii. vii. 7.

We may collect also that from three to four hundred denarii was the common price of the best unguents at Rome. Excedunt, says Pliny^h, quadringenos denarios libræ: and there was so much variety among them that even of one sort, unguent of cinnamomum, the price might vary from twenty-five, to three hundred denariiⁱ; and there was a time when the raw material of that unguent was worth one thousand or even fifteen hundred denarii a pound. Nec liquor ullus, observes Pliny of *garum*, or sauce made of *scombri*, pæne præter unguenta majore in pretio esse cœpit, nobilitatis etiam gentibus^k. Two congii of this same sauce were worth 1000 numi. Diodorus Siculus mentions an instance, in the time of Cato the elder, when a *κεράμιον Ποντικοῦ τὰρίχου* was bought at Rome for three hundred drachmæ or denarii^l.

With regard to this circumstance, then, in the history of the unction, its propriety is unquestionable;

^f Historia Plantarum, ix. 6. ^g H. N. xii. 59. ^h xiii. 4. ⁱ Ibid. i. Cf. xii. 42. ^k H. N. xxxi. 43. ^l SS. Deperditorum Vaticana Coll. ii. 85. Excerpta lib. 32. Cf. p. 114. 4.

and the supposed value of the unguent might be strictly in accordance with the truth. As to the name which is given to it both by St. Mark and by St. John^m, *νάρδος πιστική*, this is a denomination which must be reckoned among the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* of the Gospels; and as such it has occasioned much trouble to the critics. Nor is it necessary at present to enumerate the various explanations which have been proposed of it: we may notice only that one which derives *πιστικὸς* from *πιστός*, and *πιστός* from *πίω*, *potare facio* or *potandum do*; because this at first sight may appear among the most plausible, and yet, in reality, may be far from correct.

That there is such a verbal derivative as *πιστός*, used by good authors in the Greek language, and that *πιστικὸς* might be thence deducible, I should not think of denying. I would ask, however, assuming that it was so derived, what it must mean? nard *liquid*, or nard *potable*? nard the reverse of solid, or nard fit to be drunk? With regard to the first of these suppositions, it would imply a distinction without a difference; for nard *liquid* could not be so designated, except in opposition to nard *solid*; and who ever heard or read of nard *solid*? It was peculiar to every species of *μύρον*, to be made with oil, and *ἀρώματα* of some kind or another; and consequently to be liquid.

Sic ut amaracini blandum stactæque liquorem,
Et nardi florem, nectar qui naribus halat,
Quom facere instituas; cum primis quærere par est,
Quoad licet, ac possis reperire, inolentis olivi
Naturam, nullam quæ mittat naribus auram.

Lucretius, ii. 846.

Nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus olivi.

Virgil, Georgica, ii. 466.

^m Mark xiv. 3. John xii. 3.

Quod nec Virgilius, nec carmine dixit Homerus,

Hoc ex unguento constat, et ex balano.

Martial, xiv. 57, De Myrobalano.

Theophrastus : τὸ δὲ τρίτον, ὃ καὶ πλείστον ἐστίν, ὡς οἱ μυρεψοί, ξηροῖς πρὸς ὑγρά· παντὸς γὰρ μύρου καὶ χρίσματος ἢ σύνθεσις αὐτή—τῶν δὲ μύρων ἢ σύνθεσις καὶ ἡ κατασκευὴ τὸ ὅλον οἶον εἰς θησαυρισμόν ἐστι τῶν ὁσμῶν· διόπερ εἰς τοῦλαιον τίθενται· τοῦτο γὰρ χρονιώτατον, καὶ ἅμα πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν μάλισθ' ἀρμόττον^m—καὶ γὰρ ἔλαιον ὕλην μύρου καλοῦμενⁿ. Artemidorusⁿⁿ distinguishes the myropolæ by name from the aromatopolæ. Pliny, indeed, observes, Sed quosdam crassitudo maxime delectat linique jam, non solum perfundi, unguentis gaudent^o : but this implies merely that some unguents were thicker or grosser than others ; not that all were not, or ought not to have been more or less liquid. Omnis succus, says Philargyrius, quo ungi potest, unguen dicitur^p. Yet ointment of too gross and coarse a texture would scarcely deserve the name of μύρον in Greek.

Ut gratas inter mensas symphonia discors,

Et crassum unguentum, et Sardo cum melle papaver

Offendunt.

Horace, De Arte Poetica, 374.

Pliny mentions it as a common saying concerning Campania, Plus apud Campanos unguenti, quam apud ceteros olei, fieri^q. And as to unguent of nard in particular, its excellence was esteemed to consist in its fineness or tenuity more than in any other property.

With regard to the second of the above constructions ; nard, considered as *potable*, or as πιστική in the literal sense, would be an absolute nonentity. It would be possible to cite but one instance in which μύρον of some kind seems to have been made to serve the pur-

^m Περὶ ὁσμῶν, 442. *ad calcem* : 443, 444.

Operum vii. 475.

ⁿⁿ Oneirocritica, ii. 22.

ⁿ Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride.

^o H. N. xiii. 4.

^p Ad

Virgilio Georg. iii. 450.

^q H. N. xviii. 29.

pose of oil ; and that is supplied by Suetonius and Plutarch, in their Lives of Julius Cæsar ^q.

Neque sicut simplex Nævius unctam
Convivis præbebit aquam. Horace, Serm. ii. ii. 68.

Ita fit, postquam sapere urbi
Cum pipere, et palmis venit—Nostrum hoc, maris expers,
Fœniscæ crasso vitiarunt unguine pultes. Persius, vi. 38.

παραινέσαι δὲ σφῶν τι βούλομαι σοφόν·
ὅτ' ἂν φακῆν ἔψητε, μὴ 'πιχύν μύρον. Athenæus, iv. 51.

Ne plane fiat Græcum illud, de Varronis Satyra, proverbium, τό (τί) ἐπὶ τῇ φακῇ μύρον* ^r ;

* It must, indeed, be admitted that wine was sometimes mixed with *μύρα*, and *μύρα* conversely with wine ; but the former was done to temper the perfume, the latter to improve the flavour, by communicating an aromatic quality. Theophrastus, De Odoribus, 443 : *μίγνυνται δὲ τὰ μὲν αὐτῆς τῆς ὁσμῆς ἕνεκα, καὶ πρὸς ταύτην τὴν αἴσθησιν· τὰ δ' ὥσπερ ἡδύνειν βουλόμενα τὴν γεύσιν. οἶον ὥς οἱ τὰ μύρα τοῖς οἶνοις ἐπιχέοντες, ἢ τὰ ἀρώματα ἐμβάλλοντες—ἀπορήσειε δ' ἂν τις ἴσως διατί ποτε μύρον, καὶ τᾶλλα· εὖοςμα, τοὺς μὲν οἶνους ἡδύνει, τῶν δὲ βρωμάτων οὐδὲν, ἀλλὰ πάντα λυμαίνεται, καὶ ἀπύρωτα καὶ πεπυρωμένα—τῶν δὲ μύρων τὸ Αἰγύπτιον, καὶ ἡ στακτὴ, καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο πολύοδμον, καὶ μίγνυμενα τῷ οἶνῳ τῷ εὐώδει ἡδίω· περιαιρείται γὰρ ἡ βαρύτης αὐτῶν. Ibid. 449—καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οἶνων· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἐν Θάσῳ, ὁ ἐν πρυτανείῳ διδόμενος, θαυμαστός τις, ὥς ἔοικε, τὴν ἡδονὴν ἡρτυμένος ἐστίν. ἐμβάλλουσι γὰρ εἰς τὸ κεράμιον σταῖς, μέλιτι φυράσαντες· ὥστε τὴν μὲν ὁσμὴν*

ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, τὴν δὲ γλυκύτητα ἀπὸ τοῦ σταίτου λαμβάνειν τὸν οἶνον. Ibid. 451—ποιεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ οἶνου κατὰ μίξις καὶ μύρα ἔνια καὶ θυμιάματα εὐοσμότερα, καθάπερ τὴν σμύρναν. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ μύρον ἡδύνειν τοὺς οἶνους· διὸ καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ οἶνοποιίᾳ μίγνουσιν, οἱ δὲ οὕτως ἐπιχέομενον πίνουσιν. Ibid. 454 ^s.

But this mixture of unguents or perfumes with wine for such purposes, no more proves that *μύρα* by themselves were fit to be drunk, or were ever drunk ; than the circumstance of their being sometimes administered as medicines. Plutarch : *ὥσπερ γὰρ ἱατρός, ἂν συμφέρει, κρόκον καὶ νάρδον ἐπέβαλε*. Dioscorides enumerates nard, and unguent of nard, among the rest of the *Materia Medica* : and Aristides describes a prescription, recommended to him by Æsculapius, which consisted, *ὅπου τε ᾧ χρίμαθα, καὶ μύρον ναρδίνου, καὶ ἑτέρου μύρου τῶν πολυτελῶν* ^u. Pliny, it is true, speaks of the introduction of unguents into wine, in his time ;

^q Suetonius, Vita, 53. Plutarch, Vita, 17. ^r A. Gellius, xiii. 28. ^s Cf. Plutarch, Symposiaca, vi. 7. Operum viii. 768. ^t De adulatoris et amici discrimine, Operum vi. 201.

^u Oratio xxv. 494. l. 23.

If I may propose an explanation of the sense of πιστικὸς, it shall be as follows. The precious unguent called nard was obtained either wholly, or in part, from a vegetable production which bore the same name: and though it is a contested point with the learned, whether the root, ῥίζα, or the spike, σπάχυν, of this shrub was the most proper for the purpose of ointment; still whatever uncertainty there may be about the use of the former, there is none about that of the latter. Cacumina, says Pliny in his description of the plant, in aristas se spargunt: ideo gemina dote nardi spicas et folia celebrant^v. Judæa balsami lacrymam, Creta comam dictamni mittit, Arabia aromatum flores, et spicarum nardi India segetem metit^w.

Tinge caput nardi *folio*, cervical olebit:

Perdidit unguentum cum coma, pluma tenet.

Martial, xiv. 146.

Ovid, De Phœnice,

Quo simul ac casias, et nardi lenis aristas,

Quassaque cum fulva substravit cinnama myrrha;

Se super imponit, finitque in odoribus ævum.

Metamorphoseων xv. 398.

and to the like effect the author of the poem on the same subject, ascribed to Lactantius; 87.

but only to reprobate the practice, as new and disgusting. And both he (H. N. xiv. 15) and Ælian (Variæ Historiæ, xii. 31) mention a kind of spiced beverage, or sweet wine, called myrrhina (sc. potio) or myrrhinites, anciently known among both the Greeks and the Romans: which, however, is manifestly a different thing from a mixture of wine and unguents. Μυρρίτης (sc. οἶνος) is mentioned by Artemidorus,

Oneirocritica, i. 68, and along with other similar beverages, as οἶνόμελι, μελίμηλον, ὑδρόμηλον—is classed with πᾶς ὁ κατεσκευασμένος οἶνος. In like manner, Pollux, Onomasticon, vi. cap. 2. §. 1: ἦν δέ τις καὶ μυρίνης (μυρρίνης) μύρφω κεκραμένος. As to that species of wine, which was called οἶνος ἀνθοσμίας—it did not denote wine perfumed by unguents. See Suidas, in Ἀνθοσμίας, &c.

^v H. N. xii. 25.
Apostolici, 397.

^w Rufini Præfatio in Clementis Recognitiones, PP.

His addit teneras nardi pubentis aristas,
Et sociam myrrhæ vim, panacea, tuam.

That the aromatic property at least was possessed in perfection by the *leaves*, the *stalks*, and the *spikes*, appears from the following passage of Arrian, where he is giving an account of Alexander's march over the desert of Gedrosia: ἔχειν δὲ τὴν ἔρημον ταύτην καὶ νάρδου ρίζαν, πολλήν τε καὶ εὖοσμον—πολὺ δὲ εἶναι αὐτῆς τὸ καταπατούμενον πρὸς τῆς στρατιᾶς, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πατουμένου ὁδμὴν ἡδεῖαν κατέχειν ἐπιπολὺ τῆς χώρας^w. The best nard is said to have been produced about Tarsus in Cilicia^x; whence the epithet *Cilissa*, as applied to the spikenard.

Cernis, odoratis ut luceat ignibus æther,
Et sonet accensis spica Cilissa focus?

Ovid, Fasti, i. 75.

Vinaque fundantur prelis elisa Falernis,
Terque lavet nostras spica Cilissa comas.

Propertius, iv. vi. 73.

Now one of the modes by which the unguentarii obtained their perfumes, whether from the roots, or from the leaves and stalks, or from any other part of the aromatic shrub, was by pounding or braying in mortars; with a view to extract the essential oil: ἅπαντα δὲ συντίθεται τὰ μύρα observes Theophrastus: τὰ μὲν ἀπ' ἀνθῶν τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ φύλλων τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ κλωνός τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ ρίζης τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ ξύλων τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ καρποῦ τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ δακρύων μικτὰ δὲ πάνθ', ὡς εἰπεῖν^y. From such materials, there could scarcely be any other mode of obtaining the aromatic principle than that of bruising or trituration. Hence, Horace,

Pressa tuis balanūs capillis.

Carminum iii. xxix. 4.

Pliny, de myrobalano, Unguentarii autem tantum cor-

^w vi. 22.

^x Athenæus, xv. 38.

^y Περὶ ὁσμῶν, 446. ad caput paginæ.

tices *premunt*^y: again, Malobathron...ex quo *exprimitur* oleum ad unguenta^z: de omphacio, Fit et alio modo, quum in *mortariis* uva immatura *teritur*^a: de camacho, Hic est succus nuci *expressus*: de metopio, Oleum hoc est, amygdalis amaris *expressum*^a.

There are many themes in the Greek language, which, though obsolete or nearly so themselves, have yet given birth to derivatives still in existence; and consequently proving that their themes or roots also once existed. That verb, which expresses in Greek at present the act of pounding, is *πίσσω*: but *πίσσω*, as it will be readily admitted, is only another form of *πίσσω*. The existence of *πίσσω* some time or other is implied by the Latin *pinso*, (the original form whereof was *piso*—of which many instances are still to be met with *,) *pistrinum*, and the like, in kindred senses, evidently deducible from that root; but more especially from the Greek substantives *πισμός* and *πιστήρ*, both synonymous with *ληνός* or *torcular*^z, which can be immediately derived only from *πέπισμαι* and *πέπισται*, the perfect passive of *πίσσω*. *Πτίσσω* too, is recognised by Pollux, in a sense equivalent to that of *ἀλεῖν*, *molere* †. *Πιστικός*, in the corresponding signification of *apt* or

* Cato, De Re Rustica^b: Si communiter *pisunt*—Pliny: *Pisonis* a *pisendo*^c—*Pisente* filo præferrato . . . nisi intenti *pisant*—de ipsa ratione *pisendi*... *pisitur* spica^d. Quintilian: Illa leviora, *Non Pisonum, sed pistorum*^e. Servius: Et quia apud majores nostros molarum usus non erat, frumenta torrebant, et ea in pilas missa pinsebant: et hoc erat genus molendi: unde

et pinsores dicti sunt, qui nunc pistores vocantur. *Pinsere* autem dici Persius probat, ut i. Sat. 72. (58.) *A tergo quem nulla ciconia pinsit*^f.

† Καὶ ἀλεῖν δὲ τὸ πτίσσειν ἐλέγετο, κ. τ. λ. Onomasticon, vii. 5. In Suidas, in the proverbial saying, *ἀν ἀπολῆς τοὺς ὄμους ὕδωρ πτίσσων, ὁμοίως ὕδωρ μένει*: there quoted, a various reading has *πίσσων*.

^y H. N. xii. 46.

^z Ib. 59.

^a Ib. 60, 63. xiii. 2.

^b Caput cxxxvi.

^c H. N. xviii. 3.

^d Ibid. 23.

^e Institutiones Orat. ix. iii. 72.

^f Ad Æneid. i. 179.

^g Vide Phavorini Lexicon.

fit for pounding, would be regularly obtained from *πέπισται* : and *πιστικὸς*, in a similar sense, as derived from *ἐπισται*, is actually in use.

To admit then that such may be the real etymon of the term ; it is an obvious inference that the phrase *νάρδος πιστικὴ* may have been intended to denote nard, which had undergone, or was proper to undergo the process in question : that is, in one word, spikenard, or such part of the shrub as alone was qualified to yield the best ointment. If every part was not equally useful for this purpose, a term of distinction, expressing also the mode in which the ointment was to be obtained from any part, would naturally be applied to that which was the fittest of all.

The word *μύρον* is said to have been unknown to the Greek language before the time of Archilochus^h ; and, probably, the use of unguents was unknown as long also *. It was one of the luxuries which the West borrowed from the East ; that is, the Greeks derived from the Persians^{† k} : and its application, according

* Ἐσμυρισμένας κόμας | καὶ στήθος, ὡς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσματο. Athenæus, xv. 37. Ex Archilochō. Καδδ' ἐχέυσατο μύρον ἀδὺ καττῶ στήθεος ἄμμι. Ibid. 36. Ex Alcæo. Μαρτυρεῖ δ' Ἀλκαῖος κελεύων καταχέαι τὸ μύρον αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὰς πολλὰ παθοίσας κεφαλὰς καὶ τῷ πολὺ στήθεοςⁱ. Τί μὴν (μῆ) πέτεαι, συρίγγων | κοιλότερα στήθεα | χρισάμενος μύρω; Athenæus, xv. 36. Ex Anacreonte.

† Illi madent eo ; says Pliny (*loco cit.*) and again, Primum, quod equidem inveniam, castris Darii regis expugnatis, in re-

liquo ejus apparatu Alexander cepit scrinium unguentorum. Vide also vii. 30, where the same casquet is described as consisting of gold, richly encased with precious stones ; and as appropriated by Alexander to the preservation of the poems of Homer. The use of unguents among the Greeks, for a time, was considered a mark of effeminacy. The unguentarii were expelled from Lacedæmon by a public decree of the state. The laws of Solon forbade the trade in

^h Athenæus, xv. 37.
^k Pliny, H. N. xiii. 1.

ⁱ Plutarch, Symposiaca, iii. 1. Operum viii. 567.

to its first and most natural intention, was restricted to the upper part of the person. In the age of Pliny its application to the feet, among the Romans at least, was still a recent refinement: *Vidimus etiam vestigia pedum tingi; quod M. Othonem monstrasse Neroni principi ferebant*^p. In the East such an use of it must have been ancient and very general: for Quintus Curtius speaks of it as an Indian custom in Alexander's time^q; and the practice had long been familiar among the Greeks before it was adopted by the Romans.

ἔπειτ' ἀλείφεσθαι τὸ σῶμά μοι πρῶ
 μύρον ἴρινον καὶ ῥόδιον, ἄγε μοι, Ξανθία^a
 καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν χωρὶς πρῶ μοι βάκκαριν. Athenæus, xii. 78.

καὶ τοὺς πόδας
 ἀλείψατ' αὐτοῦ τῷ Μεγαλλίῳ μύρῳ. Ibid.

εἶτα τοὺς πόδας
 ἐκέλευ' ἀλείφειν πρῶτον· εἶτα τὰ γόνατα. Ibid.

ἐκ χρυσοκολλήτου γε κάλπιδος μύρῳ
 Αἰγυπτίῳ μὲν τοὺς πόδας, καὶ τὰς χέρας. Ibid.

Diogenes Laertius, de Diogene: τῷ μύρῳ τοὺς πόδας ἀλειψάμενος ἔφη, Ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς κεφαλῆς εἰς τὸν αἶρα ἀπιέναι τὸ μύρον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ποδῶν, εἰς τὴν ὄσφρησιν^r. Yet the

ointments to the male sex at least¹. Diogenes Laertius tells us of Diogenes: πρὸς τὸν μυρίζομενον· βλέπε, εἶπε, μὴ ἡ τῆς κεφαλῆς σου εὐωδία δυσωδίαν σου τῷ βίῳ παράσχη^m: of Zeno: πρὸς τὸν κεχρισμένον τῷ μύρῳ, τίς ἐστίν, ἔφη, ὁ γυναικὸς ὅζωνⁿ; of Aristippus: κακοὶ κακῶς δ' ἀπόλονται οἱ κίναδοι, οἵτινες καλὸν ἡμῶν αἰλεμμα διαβάλλουσιν^o. Yet Cle-

ment of Alexandria, even in his Pædagogus, permits the use of unguents under certain restrictions, for the sake of health, quoting one of the comic poets: καθὰ καὶ ὁ κωμικός φησί που·
 . . . μύροις | ὑπαλείφεται τὰς
 χεῖρας, ὑγείας μέρος | μέγιστον,
 ὁδμὰς ἐγκεφάλῳ χρηστὰς ποιεῖν.
 i. 209. l. 33. Pædagogus, ii. 8.

¹ Athenæus, xv. 34. Clemens Alexandrinus, i. 344. l. 34. Stromatum i. 10. Cf. i. 208. i: Plutarch, Laconica Apophthegmata, vi. 850: Seneca, Naturalium Quæstionum iv. 13. ^m vi. 66. ⁿ vii. 23. ^o ii. 76. Cf. Seneca De Beneficiis, vii. 25: Clemens Alex. i. 210. l. 6. Pædagogus, ii. 8. Suidas, in ἐκ Μασσαλίας ἥκει. ^p Pliny, H. N. xiii. 4. ^q Lib. viii. 9. ^r vi. 39.

prevalence of such a custom will render it less extraordinary that on both occasions of our Lord's unctions, and especially on the first of them, this part of his person was anointed in particular.

The introduction of ointments at Rome was prohibited so late as U. C. 565 or 566, in the censorship of Crassus and Cæsar^s. Yet before the death of Julius Cæsar, their use had become so common, that Lucius Plotius*, a noble Roman, who had been included in the proscription which ensued, and was lying in concealment at the time, was betrayed by the scent of his perfumes; Quo dedecore, says Pliny, tota absoluta proscriptio est: quis enim non merito judicet periisse tales? How passionately fond, indeed, of the sensuality in question the Romans were at this period of their history appears from the many references to it in the poets, and from the various modes in which we find it described as employed. It was lavished, in the shape of water of crocus, upon the stage.

Et quom scena croco Cilici perfusa recens est,
Araque Panchæos exhalat propter odores. Lucretius, ii. 416.

Recte, necne, crocum floresque perambulet Attæ
Fabula, si dubitem, clament periisse pudorem.

Horace, Epistolarum ii. i. 79.

Nec sinuosa cavo pendebant vela theatro,
Pulpita solennes non oluere crocos. Propertius, iv. i. 15.

Tunc neque marmoreo pendebant vela theatro,
Nec fuerant liquido pulpita rubra croco.

Ovid, De Arte Amandi, i. 103.

Hoc, rogo, non melius, quam rubro pulpita nimbo
Spargere, et effuso permaduisse croco?

Martialis, v. 25, 7. De Chæretrato.

* Valerius Maximus (vi. viii. 5.) calls this Lucius Plotius, Plotius Plancus.

^s Pliny, H. N. xiii. 3: Solinus, Polyhistor, xlvi. 2.

Festinavit Arabs ; festinare Sabæi ;
Et Cilices nimbis hic maduere suis.

Martial, Spectacula, iii. 7.

Simul croco sparsa humus, et alia in modum templi celeberrimi ^t—Sed vino mire congruit (crocum) præcipue dulci ; tritum ad theatra replenda ^u—Sparso per vias identidem croco ^v—In honorem Trajani balsama et crocum per gradus theatri fluere jussit ^w—Fistulatis, ut unguenta desuper spargerentur ^x—Hoc die utrum tandem sapientiore putas, qui invenit quemadmodum in immensam altitudinem crocum latentibus fistulis exprimat ^y—Tibi sæpenumero curandum crocum in theatro longe adque alte exprimat ^z.

Utque solet pariter totis se effundere signis
Corycii pressura croci : sic omnia membra
Emisere simul rutilum pro sanguine virus.

Lucan, Pharsalia, ix. 808.

It was an expression of gallantry to apply unguents to the posts of doors—nay even to anoint beds and couches with them.

At lacrumans exclusus amator limina sæpe
Floribus et sertis operit, postisque superbos
Unguit amaracino.

Lucretius, iv. 1170.

Nam te non viduas jacere noctes
Nequidquam tacitum cubile clamat,
Sertis ac Syrio fragrans olivo.

Catullus, vi. 6.

Ἐρράινετο τὰ πρόθυρα οἶνον καὶ μύροις ^a—ἐστεφάνωσαν τὰ πρόθυρα, μύροις ἔρραν, οἶνον πηλὸν ἐποίησαν ^b.—Moris fuerat, ut nubentes puellæ, simul venissent ad limen mariti, postes, antequam ingrederentur, propter auspicium castitatis, ornarent laneis vittis . . et oleo unguerent ; unde uxores dictæ sunt quasi unxores ^c.

^t Sallustii Fragmentum, apud Macrobius, ii. 9.

^u Pliny, H. N. xxi. 17.

^v Suetonius, Nero, 25.

^w Spartian, Hadrianus, 19.

^x Suetonius,

Nero, 31.

^y Seneca, Epistolarum 90. §. 12.

^z Frontonis Opera Inedita,

Pars ii. 226. De Orationibus, i. 2.

^a Chariton, i. p. 3. l. 6.

^b Ibid.

5. l. 7.

^c Servius ad Æneid. iv. 458.

As a personal luxury or indulgence, as part of the pleasures of the banquet*, and as an inseparable ingredient in every species of festivity, the use of unguents was universal: and to cite passages in proof of this, from the Greek or Latin poets, would be almost an endless task†. The verses of Anacreon breathe throughout of wine and perfumes.

* The time, indeed, when unguents were introduced at banquets among the ancients, was, when, as we should express it, the cloth had been drawn, and they were about to sit down to their wine. Then perfumed oils, and chaplets of flowers, were brought in. See Suidas, in Ἀβυδηνὸν ἐπιφόρημα. Idem, in Αἴρειν: εἰτ' εὐθὺς οὕτω τὰς τραπέζας αἶρετε | μύρα, στεφάνους ἐτοίμασον, σπονδὰς ποιεῖ. Menander, Κεκρυφάλῳ. Cf. also Suidas, in Πόρρω: ὡς δὲ πόρρῳ ἦσαν τοῦ πίνειν, τότε δὴ μύρον μὲν τις περιήνεγκεν· οἱ δὲ ἐχρίοντο. Also, ad Χοᾶ.

† Hæc est materia luxus, e cunctis maxime supervacui. margaritæ enim, gemmæque, ad heredem tamen transeunt: vestes prorogant tempus: unguenta illico exspirant, ac suis moriuntur horis—Nec non aliquem ex privatis audivimus jussisse spargi parietes balinearum unguento: atque Caium principem solia temperari...maxime tamen mirum est, hanc gratiam penetrasse et in castra. aquilæ certe ac signa, pulverulenta illa et custodibus horrida, inunguntur festis diebus.‡. Parum est, says Seneca, sumere unguentum, ni bis die, terque renovetur: ne eva-

nescat in corpore^u. The extravagancies which are on record in the use of unguents are almost incredible. Polybius gives a strange narrative of the freaks of Antiochus Epiphanes, in this respect as well as others; on account of which, he says, he was more deservedly to be called Epimanes^v. Caius—Nero—Helioabalus—bathed in unguents. Philostratus makes Vespasian say: Βιτέλλιος γὰρ μύρῳ μὲν λούται πλείον ἢ ἐγὼ ὕδατι· δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ ξίφει πληγεὶς μύρον ἐκδώσειν μᾶλλον ἢ αἷμα^w.—Αἱ δὲ, says Clemens Alexandrinus, of the ladies of his day, καὶ τὰς ἐσθῆτας καὶ τὰς στρωμνὰς καὶ τοὺς οἴκους ἵποθυμιῶσί τε καὶ καταβρβαίνουσιν. μονονουχί δὲ καὶ τὰς ἀμίδας ὅζειν ἀναγκάζει τοῦ μύρου ἢ τρυφῇ^x. According to Philostratus, the Indian pearl-fisher caught his prey with a bait of unguents: ἔστι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πλινθὶς σιδηρᾶ, καὶ ἀλάβαστρος μύρον. παριζήσας οὖν ὁ Ἰνδὸς τῷ ὀστρέῳ, δέλεαρ αὐτοῦ τὸ μύρον ποιεῖται· τὸ δὲ ἀνοίγνυται τε καὶ μεθύει ὑπ' αὐτοῦ^y. We read even of the anointing of a dolphin by the proconsul or legate of the proconsul of Africa: Pliny, H. N. ix. 8. Cf. Pliny, Epistolæ, ix. 33. Solum, Polyhistor, xii. §. 9.

t H. N. xiii. 4.

u Epistolæ, 86. §. 12.

v Athenæus, v. 21—25.

w Apollonius Tyan. v. 10. 236. D.

x i. 207. l. 24. Pædagogus, ii. 8.

y Apollonius Tyan. iii. 16. 156. D.

ἐρασμὴ πέλεια,
 πόθεν πόθεν πέτασαι ;
 πόθεν μύρων τοσούτων
 ἐπ' ἥρος θεούσα
 πνέεις τε καὶ ψεκάζεις ; ix. 1.

ἐμοὶ μέλει μύροισι
 καταβρέχειν ὑπήνην*
 ἐμοὶ μέλει ῥόδοισι
 καταστέφειν κάρηνα. xv. 5.

γράφε μοι τρίχας τὸ πρῶτον
 ἀπαλὰς τε καὶ μελαίνας*
 ὁ δὲ κηρὸς ἂν δύνηται,
 γράφε καὶ μύρον πνεούσας. xxviii. 6z.

ῥαῖνε δέ μιν μύρτοισιν, ἀλείφασι, ῥαῖνε μύροισιν.
 ὀλλύσθω μύρα πάντα τὸ σὸν μύρον ὦλετ' Ἀδωνις.

Poetæ Minores, ii. 242. Bion, Idyll. i. 77. ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδωνίδος.

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ κείναις

ἄρτι ποτ' ἐπλάσθη, κῆτι μύροισι νοτεῖ,

εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζηλος Βερενίκα,

ἄς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ ται Χάριτες Χάριτες. Callimachus, Epigr. 55.

Nam unguentum dabo, quod meæ puellæ

Donarunt Veneres, Cupidinesque :

Quod tu cum olfacies, Deos rogabis

Totum ut te faciant, Fabulle, nasum. Catullus, xiii. 11.

Cur non sub alta vel platano, vel hac

Pinu, jacentes sic timerè, et rosa

Canos odorati capillos,

Dum licet, Assyriaque nardo

Potamus uncti ? Horace, Carminum ii. xi. 13.

Sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum

Si gestis, juvenum nobilium cliens,

Nardo vina merebere :

Nardi parvus onyx eliciet cadum. iv. xii. 14*.

Illius e nitido stillent unguenta capillo,

Et capite et collo mollia sarta gerat. Tibullus, i. vii. 51.

* Cf. Carminum i. v. 1-3 : ii. iii. 13-16 : iii. xiv. 17, 18 : xx. 13, 14 : Epod. xvii. 23.

z Cf. xiii. 9. xx. 11. xxxix. 17. xli. 22.

Intonsi crines longa cervice fluebant,
Spirabat Syrio myrtea rore coma. Tibullus, iii. iv. 27.

Jamdudum Syrio madefactus tempora nardo
Debueram sertis implicuisse comas. iii. vi. 63.

Nequidquam perfusa meis unguenta capillis;
Ibat et expenso planta morata gradu.

Propertius, ii. iv. 5.

Quæ cum Sidoniæ nocturna ligamina mitræ
Solverit, atque oculos moverit illa graves:
Afflabunt tibi non Arabum de gramine odores,
Sed quos ipse suis fecit amor manibus. Ibid. xxix. 15.

Sit mensæ ratio, noxque inter pocula currat,
Et crocino nares myrrheus ungat onyx. iii. x. 21.

Lævis odorato cervix manabit olivo,
Et feries nudos veste fluente pedes. iii. xvii. 31*.

Veste tegor vili: nullum est in crinibus aurum:
Non Arabo noster rore capillus olet.

Sappho Phaoni, 75.

Sæpe coronatis stillant unguenta capillis,
Et trahitur multo splendida palla croco.

Cydlippe Acontio, 161.

Projicit ipse suas deducta fronte coronas,
Spissaque de nitidis tergit amoma comis. Ibid. 165.

Nec coma vos fallat, liquida nitidissima nardo:
Nec brevis in rugas cingula pressa suas.

Ovid, *De Arte Amandi*, iii. 443†.

Accipiunt sertas nardo florente coronas,
Et nunquam fugiente rosa: multumque madenti
Infudere comæ quod nondum evanuit aura
Cinnamon, externa nec perdidit aëra terra:
Advectumque recens vicinæ messis amomum.

Lucan, *Pharsalia*, x. 164.

Et matutino sudans Crispinus amomo,
Quantum vix redolent duo funera.

Juvenalis, *Sat.* iv. 108†.

* Vide also Propertius, i. ii. 3-6: iii. xiv. 28.

† Vide further, *Ars Amandi*, i. 287, 288. *Fasti*, ii. 309, 310.

‡ Cf. also Juvenal, vi. 302-304: ix. 128, 122: xi. 121-123: xv. 49, 50.

Gemmatis alii per totum balsama tectum
Effudere cadis: duro quæ saucius ungue
Niliacus pingui desudat vulnere cortex.

Claudian, xxxi. Epithal. Pall. et Celer. 121.

The use of aromata, unguents, or perfumes, among the Jews, was as ancient as the institution of their temple service; and that use was purely religious. But, besides allusions to the practice of anointing themselves, manifestly with oil ^e, there are many passages in the Old Testament, from the Exodus down to the captivity, and after it, which prove that the use of ointments or perfumes, was as ancient and customary in Judæa as in any other part of the East ^f. In other respects it seems to have been chiefly confined to funeral honours, or the last offices about the persons of the dead ^g. At the funeral of Herod, five hundred slaves or freedmen are said to have been employed in carrying the spices merely ^h. Yet this use of perfumes also was not more peculiar to the Jews than to the rest of the East; and in Seneca's or Pliny's time it was a regular part of the burial of the dead, to burn odours and unguents along with them. Puto, æque qui in *odoribus* jacet mortuus est, quam qui rapitur unco, observes the one, and Honosque et ad defunctos pertinere cœpit, the other ⁱ. At the funeral of Sylla, as Plutarch informs us, λέγεται (δὲ) τοσοῦτον πλῆθος ἀρωμάτων ἐπενεγκεῖν τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῷ, ὥστε, ἄνευ τῶν ἐν φορήμασι δέκα καὶ διακοσίοις διακομιζομένων, πλασθῆναι μὲν εἶδωλον εὐμέγεθες αὐτοῦ Σύλλα, πλασθῆναι δὲ καὶ ῥαβδούχον ἕκ τε λιβανώτου πολυτέλους καὶ κιναμώμου ^k—Non possum exprimere verbis,

^e Ruth iii. 3. 2 Sam. xii. 20. xiv. 2. Micah vi. 15. Ps. xxiii. 5. ^f Exod. xxx. 38. Prov. vii. 17. xxvii. 9. Song of Solomon i. 3. 12—14. iii. 6. iv. 10. v. 5. Ecclesiastes vii. 1. ix. 8. Ps. xlv. 8. Amos vi. 6. Isaiah iii. 24. lvii. 9. Ecclesiasticus xlix. 1. Wisdom ii. 7. Judith x. 3. ^g 2 Chron. xvi. 14. Jeremiah xxxiv. 5. ^h Jos. Bell. Jud. i. xxxiii. 9. ⁱ Seneca, Epistolæ, 82. §. 2. Pliny, H. N. xiii. 1. Vide also xii. 41. Cf. Herodian, iii 51 and iv. 3. in his description of the ceremony of the ἀποθέσις of the emperors. ^k Sylla, 38.

says Pliny the younger, writing of the premature death of a young lady, quantum animo vulnus acceperim, quum audiui Fundanum ipsum (ut multa luctuosa dolor invenit) præcipientem quod in vestes, margarita, gemmas fuerat erogaturus, hoc in thura et unguenta, et odores impenderetur¹. Poppæa, the wife of Nero, was so interred, Regum externorum consuetudine^m; concerning which fact Pliny informs us, Periti rerum asseverant, non ferre (*leg. ferri*) tantum annuo fetu, quantum Nero princeps novissimo Poppææ suæ die concremaveritⁿ. Nor were merely spices, but also *μύρα*, employed for this purpose.

τί σε δεῖ λίθον μυρίζειν ;

τί δὲ γῆ χέειν μάταια ;

Anacreon, iv. 11.

Illuc, quas mittit dives Panchaïa merces,

Eoique Arabes, dives et Assyria,

Et nostri memores lacrymæ fundantur eodem ;

Sic ego componi, versus in ossa, velim.

Tibullus, iii. ii. 23.

Desit odoriferis ordo mihi lancibus ; adsint

Plebei parvæ funeris exsequiæ. Propertius, ii. xiii. 23.

Osculaque in gelidis ponas suprema labellis,

Quum dabitur Syrio munere plenus onyx. Ibid. 29.

Adferet huc unguenta mihi, sertisque sepulcrum

Ornabit custos ad mea busta sedens. iii. xvi. 23.

Cur ventos non ipse rogis, ingrata, petisti ?

Cur nardo flammæ non oluere meæ ? iv. vii. 31.

Spiritus infelix peregrinas ibit in auras :

Nec positos artus unget amica manus.

Ovid, Ariadne Theseo, 121.

Tene ego sustineo positum scelerata videre ?

Tene meæ poterunt ungere, nate, manus ?

Consolatio ad Liviam, 135.

Atque ea cum foliis et amomi pulvere misce :

Inque suburbano condita pone solo.

Tristium iii. iii. 69.

¹ Epistolæ, v. 16.

^m Tacitus, Ann. xvi. 6.

ⁿ H. N. xii. 41.

Ille tibi exsequias, et magni funus honoris,
 Fecit; et in gelidos versit amoma sinus.
 Diluit et lacrymis mœrens unguenta profusis;
 Ossaque vicina condita texit humo.

Ovid, *Epistolæ ex Ponto*, i. ix. 51.

Mixta bibunt molles lacrymis unguenta favillæ,
 Vertice libatas accipiuntque comas. *Fasti*, iii. 561.

Non pretiosa petit cumulato ture sepulcra
 Pompeius, Fortuna, tuus: non pinguis ad astra
 Ut ferat e membris Eoos fumus odores.

Lucan, *Pharsalia*, viii. 729.

Tandemque beatulus alto
 Compositus lecto, crassisque lutatus amomis,
 In portam rigidas calces extendit. *Persius*, iii. 103.

Urnæ

Ossa inodora dabit, seu spirent cinnama surdum,
 Seu ceraso peccent casiæ, nescire paratus. *vi.* 34.

Unguenta, et casias, et olentem funera myrrham,
 Turaque de medio semicremata rogo;
 Et quæ de Stygio rapuisti cinnama lecto,
 Improbe de turpi, Zoile, redde sinu.

Martial, xi. 54.

Sed nec servilis adempto

Ignis: odoriferos exhaustit flamma Sabæos,
 Et Cilicum messes, Phariæque exemta volucris
 Cinnama, et Assyrio manantes gramine succos,
 Et Domini fletus. *Statius*, *Silvæ*, ii. vi. 85 o.

Sparge mero cineres, bene olentis et unguine nardi,
 Hospes, et adde rosis balsama puniceis.

Ausonius, *Epitaphia*, xxxvi.

Hinc maxima cura sepulcris
 Impenditur: hinc resolutos
 Honor ultimus accipit artus,
 Et funeris ambitus ornat.

Candore nitentia claro
 Prætendere lintea mos est:
 Adpersaque myrrha Sabæo
 Corpus medicamine servat.

Prudentius, *Operum* i. 72. *Cathemerinon* x. 45—52.

Upon this usage was founded our Lord's prophetic, and at the same time benevolent, interpretation of the act of Mary ^p, when the disciples in general, or Judas in particular, were complaining of the needless waste of a precious article. Let the woman alone—why are ye troubling her? She hath done unto me a becoming deed—against the day of my embalment hath she reserved it. The office, which she had just performed, was a good and a proper one, insomuch as it was, or should be, the embalment of our Lord's body against his burial. For this was, strictly speaking, the only embalment which his body was to receive; and for that purpose, κατὰ συμβεβηκός, if not *per se*, it might be said to be intended; and its effect was ultimately to be reserved: which is the import of the prophetic preterite, τέτληκεν, John xii. 7.

^p Mark xiv. 6. 8. John xii. 7.

DISSERTATION XXXIII.

On the two dispossessions, and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost : or the comparison of Matt. xii. 22-45. with Luke xi. 14-36.

I HAVE purposely reserved this comparison for the present period of the work, because, the more certain it might be that the occasions, to which these portions of St. Matthew's and of St. Luke's Gospel respectively relate, were altogether different, the more necessary it became to consider the question of their identity upon the last instance of their occurrence, rather than upon the first.

To the supposition of this distinctness there is nothing to object on the score of antecedent improbability. Miracles of dispossession in general were among the most familiar of our Saviour's miraculous acts; and miracles of dispossession in particular were the only such acts, which either in their own nature admitted of the charge in question, or by the matter of fact can be proved to have had it advanced against them. St. Matthew's Gospel alone demonstrates the reality of two such instances; one, ix. 32-34, the other, xii. 22; the former of which was not merely distinct from, but actually in point of time posterior to the latter. It is nothing extraordinary that St. Luke should add a third.

The reality of these miracles was never disputed, even when the agency by which they were wrought was called in question. It could not be and it was not denied that dispossession had been produced, even when the cause of the dispossession was attributed to Satan. For if there were such beings as the devils or demons;

and such a person as the ruler of the devils or demons; then it would be self-evident that the former must be subject to the latter; and at *his* command, in any manner made known to them, might be expected either to evacuate, or to take possession of the bodies of men. The ruler of the demons, therefore, if he chose to co-operate with a man, might enable even a man to work such miracles as these; miracles of simple dispossession; attended at the utmost with the removal of those effects only of which possession had been the cause. But more than this there is no reason to suppose that the prince of the devils, though he cooperated with a man, could enable a man to perform: nor, as I have already observed, is the same charge of being wrought by diabolical assistance found to be advanced against any class of miracles except this.

Now miracles of simple dispossession were among the earliest and the commonest of our Saviour's miracles in general: and as miracles of this description, *a priori*, were peculiarly liable to such an insinuation, it is not improbable that it might be frequently levelled against them; and that our Lord would have repeated occasions, in the course of his ministry, to expose its absurdity. And if any one Evangelist had given a full and particular account both of the charge and of its refutation, upon a certain former instance of their occurrence, that alone would be a sufficient reason why he might pass them over, or only notice them in general, upon a second and a later. Accordingly, though St. Matthew himself specifies the fact of the insinuation *twice*, yet he particularizes the fact of the refutation only *once*; and that, as we have seen, after the *first* occasion of their occurrence in the order of succession, though the *second* in the order of narration.

Still less improbable is the supposed repetition of

the demand of a sign; of which there is one instance, John ii. 18, another, Matt. xii. 38, a third, Matt. xvi. 1, Mark viii. 11, besides this, xi. 16, in St. Luke. The testimony of St. Paul—*Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖον αἰτοῦσι, καὶ Ἕλληνες σοφίαν ζητοῦσι*^a—shews that, in fact, it was a regular demand even in his time; and in reference to the emissaries of Christianity as much as to our Saviour himself. It is further confirmed also by this characteristic circumstance in the appearance and demeanour of the false Christs, or false Prophets, who rose up from time to time among the Jews, subsequent to the Christian era; that all such impostors came with *signs* of some kind or other: which Josephus, indeed, describes in general as signs of one sort, those of liberty or deliverance. But Barchocheb, in the time of Hadrian, assumed his name in reference to a sign from heaven; *ὥς δὲ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φωστὴρ αὐτοῖς κατεληλυθὼς, κακουμένοις τε ἐπιλάμψαι, τεραπεύόμενος*^b. The true name, indeed, of the sign, which the Jews demanded from our Saviour, was the sign from heaven; not a sign of deliverance as such: and tradition might have taught them to expect that something of the kind would precede the advent or the appearance of the Messiah. For the Divine legation of Moses had been specially attested by signs: and they might expect the same fact to hold good of the Christ. Moreover our Saviour has taught us that some sign, which he calls the sign of the Son of man, shall precede the second appearance of the Christ at least; and that sign is to appear in the heavens^c. Nor can it be denied that, howsoever the knowledge of them might be obtained, many mysterious truths relating to the second coming of the Messiah, and which may yet be fully verified of

^a 1 Cor. i. 22.^b Eusebius, *Historia Eccles.* iv. 6. 118. C.^c Matt. xxiv. 30.

that, were already not obscurely understood by the Jews; and were so implicitly referred to the first, that their not being realized in respect to that was, probably, one of the chief reasons of the rejection of our Lord himself.

Not to dwell however upon general arguments, but to approach to the discussion of the question on its proper grounds, I observe First, that if these two accounts are to be considered identical, St. Luke is directly set at variance on some points with St. Matthew, and on others with St. Matthew and with St. Mark.

I. St. Matthew affirms that, when our Saviour went out of the house, where the blasphemy against the Spirit had been committed, he went to the shore of the lake and he went thither to teach: St. Luke that, when he had done refuting the charge, he went to the house of a Pharisee and he went thither to dine.

II. St. Matthew and St. Mark both affirm that our Lord repaired to the lake not merely with a view to teach, but to teach in *parables*; and consequently that, for that day at least, he spake nothing in the way of general instruction distinct from parables: St. Luke affirms that he delivered both to his own disciples, and also to the people, a *moral discourse* of considerable length, which occupies the whole of his twelfth chapter; and immediately after that, another and a shorter, but not a less instructive one, recorded xiii. 1-9. All this our Lord must have done between the close of the previous discussion, and the beginning to teach in parables.

III. St. Matthew very plainly implies^d that, until this day, neither the disciples nor the multitude had ever heard a *parable*; and consequently that the parables which were now delivered were the first instances

^d Ch. xiii. 1. 10. 13.

of their kind, as yet known or remembered to have transpired. But St. Luke shews that, on this very morning, and perhaps only a few minutes before, *four* separate parables^e, the first a moral parable, the three last all allegorical parables, had already been pronounced.

Now these are inconsistencies which lie upon the face of the respective accounts; and except on one supposition, viz. that the occasions themselves, to which these accounts relate, were perfectly distinct, they are as difficult to reconcile or to explain satisfactorily, as they are obvious and palpable.

Secondly; upon a more minute inspection of either narrative, there appears to be scarcely a single *individing*, and at the same time *identical* mark of agreement between them. The time—the place—the subjects of the miracle—the circumstances which preceded and drew forth the discourse—the parties addressed—the arrangement, substance, and particulars of the discourse itself—the circumstances which followed upon it; all are more or less discriminated asunder in each: as may thus be shewn by considering these things in their order.

I. The times of the two events. The time of the dispossession in St. Matthew, as it appears from a comparison with St. Mark, was the usual time of some meal in the day, which I endeavoured to prove elsewhere was most probably the morning's^f; or not much later than it. The time of the morning's meal among the Jews, at every period of the year alike, was *πρωὴ* or the first hour of the day^g. But the time of the dispossession in St. Luke was manifestly either the time, or only just before the time of the *ἄριστον*, or midday's repast;

^e Ch. xii. 16—21. 35—40. 41—46. xiii. 6—9.
Dissertation xxiii.

^g Cf. John xxi. 4. 12.

^f Supra, 333, 334.

which, on every day but the sabbath, when it was one hour later, was taken at the *fifth* hour of the morning^h. Nor was it much otherwise among the Greeks or Romansⁱ. Between this time and the former, there would consequently be three or four hours' difference.

II. The place. The scene of the dispossession in St. Matthew was doubtless Capernaum itself; but the scene of the dispossession in St. Luke, though it might be some other city of Galilee, could scarcely be Capernaum. For our Lord, so early as x. 38, had already begun his circuit; and at xi. 1 he is described as praying in *a certain place*; which we may conclude infallibly was no town nor village, and certainly not such an one as Capernaum. Or, though there should be any difficulty still remaining on this point, yet the place of the dispossession in St. Matthew was unquestionably some *private* house, so completely beset by the multitude that even our Lord's relations could not procure an access to him; whereas the place of the dispossession in St. Luke was the *open* air, and while Jesus at first was comparatively *alone*; but whither the people afterwards flocked round about him. For such is the meaning of the expressions, τῶν δὲ ὄχλων ἐπαθροίζομένων—xi. 29.

III. The subjects of the miracle. The subject of the miracle in St. Matthew was a demoniac *blind* and *dumb*; the subject of the miracle in St. Luke was a demoniac simply *dumb*.

There cannot be a clearer discrimination between the personal identity of two different subjects of a common miracle, than this. Had St. Luke's demoniac been really the same with St. Matthew's, then—not to insist on the improbability of his omitting any part

^h Jos. Bell. Jud. ii. viii. 5. Vita 54.

ⁱ Suidas, Ἀριστον.

of his case at all—if he must suppress one of these circumstances, it would have been the *dumbness*, and not the *blindness*; for the former was a common and obvious characteristic of possession, but not the latter. Of a *blind* demoniac, if we except this in St. Matthew, there is no example in all the Gospels; of *dumb*, and what is just as common and very much akin to dumb, of *deaf* demoniacs there are many instances; or to speak more correctly, there are scarcely any other.

We may infer therefore that the blindness in this case was no consequence of mere possession; nor therefore naturally or necessarily to be removed upon the removal of the possession. Hence though St. Luke might not have specified the dumbness, as almost too common a feature of the case to require specification, he would never have omitted the blindness, a truly singular and characteristic circumstance; the removal of which was to change the nature of the miracle, or materially to exalt it. For to give sight to the blind, especially to one naturally, or born, blind, was always accounted one of the most illustrious of miracles; and considered in a moral or typical point of view, it was not more illustrious than characteristic of a spiritual Messiah. Simple dispossession even the Jewish exorcists, and much more our Lord's disciples in his life time, might attempt and be able to effect; but not the restoration of sight: nor was simple dispossession, though accompanied by the removal of its ordinary effect, the loss of speech or of hearing, on any principle so splendid an exertion of Divine power, or so likely to affect the spectators with admiration, as dispossession accompanied not only by that, but by the removal of a much more uncommon and otherwise an incurable evil, the want of sight.

The case of the two demoniacs at Gadara is no in-

stance of a similar omission: for *there* the same identical miracle was performed on two individually distinct subjects of it; but *here* a double specific miracle was performed on the same subject: *there* it was not necessary for the sake of the miracle to describe its operation on more than one of its different subjects; *here* it was manifestly necessary to specify its double operation on the same subject. The miracle was the same thing in that instance, whether as wrought upon one person, or as wrought upon two persons; but it was not the same in this, if it did not open the eyes as well as eject the spirit. St. Luke might have special reasons, at that time, for limiting the account of the cure to one of its cases; but he could have none here which would not require him to omit the miracle entirely, if he did not record the whole of it. He must as soon have thought of dividing the person, or making one man into two, as of confounding the miracle, or representing the double cure as a single one.

IV. The cause which produced the discourse, and the parties concerned in the former and addressed by the latter. As the discourse, in each of the Evangelists, is alike divided into two general heads, and alike directed to two special purposes; so have they each assigned to these heads a proper but a different origin. The cause of the first was the charge affecting the miracle; the cause of the second was the demand of the sign. But St. Matthew affirms that the charge was made at a separate time from the demand; St. Luke, that they were both made together: St. Matthew, that the demand was preferred *after* our Saviour had begun to refute, but *before* he had made an end of refuting the charge; St. Luke, that both had taken place before he began to refute or to answer either: St. Matthew, that the authors of the charge and those

who demanded the sign, were the *same*, viz. the Scribes and the Pharisees; St. Luke, that the authors of each respectively were *distinct*, and neither of them Scribes or Pharisees. Some of the multitude advanced the charge, and others of the multitude demanded the sign. Now this is not the way in which either he, or any other of the Evangelists, ever speaks of the Scribes and the Pharisees, where they are expressly intended; but always by their proper name.

V. The order, substance, and particulars of the discourse in each: and first, the order. As St. Matthew represents the demand to be interposed while our Saviour was refuting the charge, so he describes the answer, which declines the demand, to be also interposed before the conclusion of the reply to the charge: as he makes the Scribes and the Pharisees interrupt Jesus to put the demand, so he makes him stop with his previous reply to the charge, in order to answer their demand. For it is evident that, from xii. 38–42, every thing in his account relates to the sign—and from xii. 43–45, every thing relates to the charge; and still more evident is it that the whole of xii. 38–42 comes between xii. 22–37 and xii. 43. And this arrangement, if it follows the order of the event, is consistent and natural; but not so, if it has purposely inverted it.

Again; as St. Luke represents the charge which produced one part of our Lord's discourse, and the demand which occasioned the other, both to have been preferred at once, so he represents the answer to the one as made and concluded before the answer to the other was begun. For, as distinct things in themselves, they would require to be answered distinctly; one answer could not serve for both. Hence, they must be answered one after the other; they could not

both have been answered at once: and as the charge was first mentioned as made, so the answer to the charge is first specified as returned; and then the reply to the demand. Besides which the charge, as affecting the miracle, was a much more serious thing than the demand of the sign; and therefore, though they had both been preferred together, the former would require to be answered before the other. This arrangement of St. Luke's, if he also is the faithful narrator of a real event, is just as consistent and natural as, on the same principle, was St. Matthew's. But in this case the two accounts cannot be the same. And should any one question whether the answer to the charge, as represented by St. Luke, was actually over when the reply to the demand was begun; there are two facts in his narrative, one at the end of the former and the other at the end of the latter, either of which is sufficient to prove it. The first is the exclamation of the woman^k, expressly directed to the wisdom and strength of the reply to the charge, and consequently implying that that was over; the second is the gathering of the people together^l about the spot where our Lord was; which was either the moving cause, or at least the circumstance of situation, from which or under which he proceeded to answer the demand.

Secondly, the substance. The most cursory inspection of the two discourses shews that, while they agree in some things, they differ in others: a more particular examination proves that this agreement is far from entire or absolute; and this disagreement far from partial or insignificant. There is much in St. Matthew not even hinted at in St. Luke—and much in St. Luke altogether missing in St. Matthew. Upon the question of agreement I shall speak hereafter: but on

^k Ch. xi. 27, 28.

^l Ib. 29.

the question of disagreement we may observe at present, that the mere circumstance of one Evangelist's omitting some things, supplied by another, or supplying some things omitted by another, even in a common account would be nothing extraordinary ; for omission is not contradiction, nor supplement refutation, even where agreement was most to be expected ; viz. in the record of words or discourses, not merely of actions or proceedings. But here, there is reason to conclude that neither the omission nor the supplement in question was arbitrarily or undesignedly made ; but for a very sufficient motive ; viz. because neither of them was part of the transaction to which the rest of the narrative belongs.

The omission in St. Matthew, as collected from what is present over and above in St. Luke, xi. 33–36, relates altogether to the demand of the sign ; the omission in St. Luke, as similarly ascertained from St. Matthew, xii. 31–37, relates entirely to the question of the charge. We shall find moreover, that the general subject of St. Luke's omission is the particular denunciation of the heinousness of the charge in one of its bearings, and the personal denunciation of the malignity of its authors in reference to the same ; but the subject of the omission in St. Matthew is a general statement of the means or evidences of conviction, in regard to their natural effect on the understanding ; a general description of the proper faculty whose business it is to judge of them ; and a general denunciation or warning what is to be finally expected, if this proper faculty is not employed, in its proper department and on its proper subject, with becoming simplicity of purpose and its natural good effect. In the first of these omissions, consequently, there is nothing to encourage but every thing to alarm ; in the second

there is much to alarm but something withal to encourage: in the former there is not an hope expressed that the parties addressed could ever be reclaimed or become better; in the latter, however uncertain that they will, it is yet implied that they may.

If now we compare St. Mark's account of this transaction with St. Matthew's; the agreement between which, as far as they go together, is unquestionable; we shall see that, though St. Matthew records only *one*, there were in reality *two* insinuations urged upon this occasion; the one, ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει—explained and confirmed by what follows, ὅτι ἔλεγον· πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει—which clearly implies that, by saying Christ had Beelzebub, they meant to say Christ had an unclean spirit; the other, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια^m. The reality of both these insinuations therefore is placed beyond a question: and their distinct tendency is not less indubitable. The former was a personal charge, levelled against the Spirit by whom our Saviour was inspired; the latter was a personal charge, levelled against himself, and affecting the reality of his character as a prophet. The former would have made him a demoniac, or worse than a demoniac; because inspired by the Devil; but not an impostor, nor a deceiver: the latter would have made him an impostor or a deceiver, but not a demoniac; because only in league with, not possessed nor actuated by the Devil. The absurdity of each supposition was, also, evidently the same; and consequently, as far as they required or deserved to be refuted at all, so far the propriety and pertinency of refuting them both by exactly the same arguments likewise must be apparent.

But with respect to the comparative heinousness or

^m Mark iii. 22. 30. Cf. 2 Kings i. 2.

veniality of both, there was that in the nature of the object, in the specific direction of each—in the party respectively affected by the charge—which made a very great difference between them. The one was levelled against God; the other against man: the one personally affected the Holy Ghost; the other only our Saviour as a mere man. The one was blasphemy, that is, *slander*, of the Spirit; the other was blasphemy or *slander* of the Son of man. Our Saviour therefore might, if he pleased, not impute the latter; but he could not, on any principle, not impute the former. He could not indeed but denounce the *sinfulness* of both: yet he might, consistently with his character and his demeanour in other respects, declare himself willing to *forgive* the one, which simply concerned himself; but he could not, on the same principle, undertake to forgive the other which affected the Holy Ghost.

Hence then the substance of the whole omission in St. Luke, and of the whole supplement in St. Matthew; who, though he specially records the second of these insinuations only, yet gives us conjointly the answer to both; just as St. Mark, who records them both, supplies in particular the answer only to one, or touches but very cursorily on that to the other. Hence also the denunciation of the greater atrocity of the blasphemy, levelled against the Spirit and personally impugning the Spirit, than that of the blasphemy levelled against the Son of man, and personally affecting our Saviour: hence, the declaration that the forgiveness of the one was *possible*, but the forgiveness of the other was *impossible*; that the one should actually be forgiven, that is, *not imputed*, but the other should not be forgiven, and therefore necessarily must be *imputed*: hence too, the denunciation of the personal

malignity of the authors of each ; which, in respect to the offence pronounced unpardonable, is justly described as really *incurable*, but in respect to that which was to be or might be forgiven, whether really *incurable* or not, still is not described as such. For these are the utmost purposes to which Matthew xii. 31-37, containing the supplement in question, admits of being generally reduced ; and they are clearly all of a *personal* nature, in resentment of a *personal* charge as concerns the party who is speaking, and *personally* denouncing its authors as concerns the persons addressed by him.

If we compare with this the account of the same things in St. Luke, we shall perceive that he records so much of the same charge as directly affected our Saviour, but not that part of it which personally affected the Holy Ghost ; and he omits, in his account of the reply, all the personal matter in respect to both. If the former charge was the only one made on the occasion in question, he has done no more than was to be expected : for if the same personal charge against our Saviour was not now accompanied by the same personal charge against the Holy Ghost, as before, he would have no need now, as he had then, to notice the charge against the Spirit along with the reply to the charge against himself ; and what he had said before of the personal offence against himself, he might waive in the answer at present, because not combined with the other in the provocation ; that is, he might consent to forgive or to overlook this totally *now*, when it stood by itself, as he had said that he would forgive or overlook it comparatively *then*, when it had been coupled with the other. But if this second charge was really preferred, and was really answered now, as well as the first, I know not upon what principle we could excuse St. Luke for the omission of a

part, and that the most important *part*, of the same continuous detail, which would not require him to have omitted the *whole*.

If however the charge against our Saviour alone was now repeated; a charge, which so far as it was the subject of argument, concerned the question by *whose* power, God's or Satan's, our Lord was enabled to cast out devils; and so far as it bore a personal relation, concerned the question whether Christ was what he claimed to be, a Prophet sent from God and empowered by God, or an Impostor in league with and empowered by the Devil: there is one observable distinction in the two accounts, which becomes on this supposition critical and consistent; but on any other singular and inexplicable. The *status quæstionis* in St. Matthew was virtually this; whether these miracles were wrought by the Spirit of God or by Beelzebub, *dwelling in Christ*: the *status quæstionis* in St. Luke, whether the same miracles were wrought by the power of God or by the power of Satan, *cooperating with Christ*. Now when the answer, in each case, has occasion to revert to this question, how is it expressed in St. Matthew? Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ—and how in St. Luke? Εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ—and this is a difference in the terms of the same proposition, which the Evangelist, except on the authority of our Lord himself, and out of deference to the matter of fact, would not have made; because it was to change an appropriate and intelligible expression, for one much more ambiguous and difficult to be understood. The Gentile reader was likely to comprehend at once the meaning of ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ; but not the idiomatic Hebraism ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ in general, nor the refined distinction of its meaning here in particular.

There are three words in the Hebrew, all used to

express not only the various energies, but also the several degrees of the energies of the power of God, with respect to the comparative sensible magnitude of its effects; the finger (*δάκτυλος*), the hand (*χείρ*), the arm (*βραχίον*) of God. The expression *ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ* then would be a very proper description for the degree of the power of God, in opposition to the power of Satan, where the subject of discussion was the production of such miracles as these—miracles of simple dis-possession; miracles of the simplest kind; so far from the hardest and most stupendous, as to rank among the easiest, of the works of God: miracles which, together with another class almost as inferior, the healing of diseases, even the Twelve and the Seventy had been already empowered to perform; and the ability of performing which continued with the Church, long after all its other miraculous graces either had totally ceased, or were still very rarely exerted. But the same phrase would not have been employed to express a like degree of power, with respect to the production of such a miracle as opening the eyes of the blind; had that also now taken place. No Prophet under the old dispensation, no Apostle or Evangelist under the new, before the commencement of formal Christianity, none but our Saviour himself, had ever yet performed, or been enabled to perform a miracle of that description; so that the assertion of the man in St. John, who had himself experienced such a miracle, might be more than the effusion of gratitude for his recent cure; might be even historically true: *ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἤκουσθη ὅτι ἤνοιξέ τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένον*ⁿ. Philo Judæus was well aware of this distinction of terms, when he made the following observations on the plague of lice^o. *Τί γὰρ εὐτελέστερον σκνιπός; ἀλλ' ὅμως τοσοῦ-*

ⁿ Ch. ix. 32.

^o Exod. viii. 19. Operum ii. 98. l. 15—21. De Mose.

τον ἰσχυσεν, ὡς ἀπαγορεύσαι πᾶσαν Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐκβοᾶν ἀναγκασθῆναι ὅτι δάκτυλος Θεοῦ τοῦτ' ἔστι· χεῖρα γὰρ Θεοῦ μηδὲ τὴν σύμπασαν οἰκουμένην ὑποστῆναι αὖν, ἀπὸ περάτων ἐπὶ πέρατα, μᾶλλον δ' οὐδὲ τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον.

Again, with regard to the omission in St. Matthew, or what is distinctly supplied by St. Luke, we may observe that it is expressly subjoined to the account of the answer to the demand of the sign : it is doubtless therefore subservient to the use and purpose of that answer in general. And as St. Luke has made the demand, which produced the answer, proceed from the people at large, so he has made the answer, which replies to the demand, be returned to the people at large.

Now though we knew no more of the nature of the sign in question than is implied in the terms of the demand, yet thus much we might reasonably presume concerning it : it must have been something *extraordinary* ; totally different from what had yet occurred, or might still be expected to occur in the way of proof : it must have been something decisive, something which would leave no doubt that he, by whom this sign were to be given, was the Messiah ; and such a Messiah as they who required the sign expected. Thus much, I say, we might justly conclude concerning this particular sign, from *their* importunity who requested it, and from our Saviour's refusal who steadfastly and pointedly declined it.

It was some sign therefore which, as the true Messiah and consistently with his own character, he could not consent to give ; it was some sign which, to prove himself the true Messiah, it was not necessary that he should give. And whatever other reasons for dispensing with this extraordinary medium of proof, there might be besides, this also, as we may presume, would

be one; viz. that he had other proofs, both worthy of his character to produce, and adequate to the end for which they might be produced; among which proofs, however numerous or various they might be, his miracles at least could not fail to constitute an integral and an important class.

Reasoning then specifically in answer to the demand of an extraordinary proof, our Saviour, it might naturally be expected, would do *two* things; appeal to his miracles in general, and insist on their sufficiency in general. And if there were any one among his miracles in general, which approximated most nearly to the nature of an extraordinary sign, and consequently of an extraordinary proof in particular, he might with equal consistency appeal especially to this, and insist especially on this. Such was the miracle of the Resurrection; a sign of the Divine power of Christ, which is unquestionably the corner stone of the miraculous evidence in its behalf. Accordingly both in St. Matthew and in St. Luke, so far as they agree together, he is represented as appealing to this, and as insisting on its sufficiency in particular: but in St. Matthew, he is represented as doing only this; in St. Luke, as doing something more; viz. appealing to his miracles in general, and insisting on the sufficiency of his miracles in general.

Now when a competent medium of conviction on any point is addressed to a competent medium of apprehension, the failure of conviction must needs be due to a moral incapacity, distinct from both, and not to a physical defect, peculiar to either. On the question whether our Saviour was or was not the Messiah, his miracles supplied the one, and the common sense of mankind supplied the other. If then the people came to a wrong conclusion upon the question at last,

the fault attached neither to the inadequacy of the means of conviction, nor to the incompetency of their natural faculties ; but solely to the perversity of their will, producing a moral impossibility of being duly influenced by the strongest proofs, biassing the judgment in spite of instinct, and clouding the light of the clearest evidence.

It was natural therefore that, speaking as before of the character and sufficiency of his proper media of proof, our Saviour should say something of the only cause, which prevented them from attaining their end and justifying the efficiency of their nature itself : which as a cause in its origin attributable to the hearers, he might stigmatize in terms of becoming severity ; as a cause in its effects so fatally prejudicial to their good, he might as feelingly lament and deplore ; as a cause considered in each of these bearings, he might both stigmatize and lament. Accordingly in each of the Evangelists he is represented as doing both these things ; in St. Matthew however with respect to the miracle of the Resurrection in particular ; in St. Luke, and that in the part omitted by St. Matthew, with respect also to his miracles in general. The analysis of the Epilogus itself will set this assertion in the clearest light.

For first, our Lord reminds his hearers that they themselves did nothing, even in the commonest acts of life, without having a proper end and purpose in view by it ; nor in such a manner as would defeat that end and purpose itself. He wishes them to infer from this that neither were his miracles wrought without a specific design, nor in any manner but what was calculated to give effect to that design ; publicly and in the face of the world, so that all might see them ; demonstrably and sensibly, so that none might mistake

them ; exceeding the ability of man and overstepping the course of nature, so that none might dispute them.

Secondly, he tells them that their common sense and their understandings were just as much intended, and just as effectual for directing and assisting their judgments, as the faculty of sight for guiding the motions of the body. The eye, as they well knew, never failed to perform this service for the body, so long as it was sound and vigorous ; nor continued competent to perform it, when it was distempered or decayed. He argues therefore that their understandings also, exerted upon a competent medium of proof, and if there were nothing besides within them to interfere with their natural operation, would not fail to lead them to a right conclusion concerning himself. Under this image of a single and a double, that is, a good and an evil eye, he describes a clear and unperverted, or a clouded and contaminated faculty of judgment ; and consequently plainly implies that the obscuring and perverting cause is *moral* ; the obliquity of the will ; the force of prejudice ; the corrupting influence of evil habits or evil passions ; and the like : for the same faculty of judgment, or power of reasoning in general, in conjunction with the will, and left free or not free to its natural effect as that will is simple or disingenuous, honest or depraved, is always in Scripture denoted by the metaphor of the same eye, producing or not producing its natural effects, as the qualities, by which it is affected, are friendly or unfriendly to the natural energies of vision.

Hence, if they did not consider his miracles a sufficient proof that he was the Messiah, the blame must ultimately rest with the disinclination of their own minds, however produced, to attend to those proofs ; to

acquiesce in that conclusion ; to receive and to be satisfied with the natural decision of their judgments upon the evidence before them. The true cause of their incredulity must, consequently, be sought within themselves ; in the *evil* heart of unbelief. Consider, says he, whether the *light* within thee is not *dark* ; whether that, which would otherwise be the natural means of bringing thee to the truth, is not so corrupted and depraved by other principles, as to be now of necessity the medium of error. For it is in vain to deny that the understandings of men may be influenced by their passions ; and the conclusions of the judgment may be as sensibly affected by its sympathy with the will and the feelings, as the impressions of sight by the medium through which the rays are transmitted to the eye. If the result of this scrutiny should be favourable, and the light of the mind be found to be still clear and genuine, he bids them follow its spontaneous directions : it would not fail to exhibit things as they were, and to mark out the path before them : the simple drift of all which is to assure them that their own understandings, fairly and dispassionately applied to the means of conviction submitted to them, could not but conclude that Jesus was the Messiah.

I have been the more diffuse in this exposition, with a view to shew how great is the difference in our Saviour's manner of treating the inquirers, concerned in the demand of a sign in St. Luke, and those who were concerned in the same demand in St. Matthew : and we have seen that there was a similar difference in his manner of dealing with the authors of the charge in each. With the one he dealt in the language of just indignation and of stern rebuke ; with the other, in the tone of grave displeasure and serious but affectionate admonition. What was personal in

the one becomes general in the other; and where he thundered and threatened before, he reasons, he expostulates now. There is enough of severity to shew that he was offended; there is so much of gentleness, as implies his anger to be mixed with pity. He represents the case of his hearers as sufficiently dangerous to create alarm, yet not so far gone as to justify despair. Before, however, in the personal part of St. Matthew's account—the part omitted by St. Luke—if any one spirit predominated in the whole and actuated the whole, it was a feeling of utter abhorrence at the atrociousness of the crime; a feeling of utter reprobation of the malignity of its motive; a feeling of utter despair of the reformation of its authors. We cannot conceive the most exalted and perfect of beings capable of expressing his feelings towards the most wicked and depraved, consistently with his own dignity and purity, in terms more severe than these ^P: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν, πονηροὶ ὄντες; which are equalled but not excelled in the same respect by those others, delivered on a later occasion to the same persons ^Q—ὄφεις, γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης; What is there in St. Luke, which approaches in severity to this?

The use, which we may make of this fact in the difference of our Lord's manner, upon two distinct occurrences, towards an apparently similar offence, is to infer first, that the authors of the offence in either case are what they are; some of the Pharisees in St. Matthew, and some of the people in St. Luke: secondly, that in the commission of the offence the Scribes and the Pharisees acted deliberately, and with malice prepense; the people, only as they had been taught by them. The former then had been instigated by their own malig-

nity; the latter had been misled by the former. Neither indeed disputed the miracle; but both resolved it into a cause, distinct from the true: neither denied that miracles might furnish signs; but both would have it to be understood that these miracles were not *the* sign. The Pharisees however did not believe in their own solution of the miracle, on the one hand, nor expect compliance with their demand of a sign, on the other: but they threw out the solution to discredit the authority of the real cause, and to counteract the natural impression of the miracle; and they preferred the demand, that they might reduce our Saviour to the necessity of publicly refusing it at least. The people took up the solution as coming from them, and urged it again in a besotted deference to the judgment of their teachers; and so long as the demand was refused, it was easy to say *no* sign, independent of *that*, which our Saviour could exhibit, was sufficient to prove him the Messiah. There was *one* sign which would prove this; and while that was withheld, none other should be considered satisfactory.

To establish each of these positions by a distinct proof would require a longer discussion than my present limits would admit of: I shall therefore observe barely that there is no proof of the fact either of the charge against these miracles or of the demand of a sign from heaven, until they were each advanced by the Pharisees first; nor any instance of the allegation of the charge, except in the case of a recent miracle, and of a miracle which had produced a *lively* effect. We may perceive a reason then why our Lord might possibly compassionate the ignorant and deluded multitude, while he could only abhor and reprobate the artful malignity of their teachers; and consequently why he might *argue* with the one, while he denounced nothing but penal

retribution against the other. Hence too in the ensuing discourse, Luke xii. 57, and in allusion to this very subject, he might address the people with the pointed question, there recorded; τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον;

It may however be objected that the allegory of the unclean spirit, which the particle δὲ in St. Matthew^r shews to be the resumption of a former topic, as a comparison with St. Luke does that this topic is that of the charge, is inconsistent with the supposition of a different spirit in the later address, as contrasted with the former. To refute this objection, we will consider the allegory somewhat at large.

This comparison, or illustration, for it is nothing more, proceeds on two self-evident positions; one, that an unclean or wicked spirit delights in an unclean and impure abode; the other, that he who has not been made better by what has been done to reclaim him, has necessarily been rendered worse. The result to which they lead in conjunction is consequently this: an evil or impure spirit once dispossessed, if he gains possession of the same soul again, gains possession of that which is fitter to receive him than before, and so is more firmly rooted than ever; that is, the case of the man's recovery is sevenfold more hopeless than before. Now let us see how the parable developes these principles, or brings this result to pass.

First, the foundation of the allegory, or the circumstance which suggested the analogy, was the recent dispossession which had taken place. Hence the first particular in each narrative, which supposes the spirit ejected.

Secondly, according to the opinion of the times, the proper abode of evil spirits, banished from the society

or from the souls of men, was waste places, deserts, and rocks. Hence the next particular—the walking of the spirit δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων—and, in defect of his former habitation, seeking for a place of rest; but, from the superior fitness or attractions of that, finding none: all which supposes the fact of the dispossession complete, and the recovery of the party possessed, for some time at least, to be certain.

Thirdly, according to the same belief, and perhaps the truth of the case, evil spirits, which had once taken possession of the souls of men, not only were hard to be dislodged, but as finding nothing elsewhere so congenial to the impurity of their own nature, were ever after longing to take possession of them again. Hence the next particular; the spirit's determining to return, and to see if, haply, his former habitation might afford an opening for his entering into it again.

Fourthly, the next particular is the supposed result of this experiment. He finds it empty, or rather at *leisure*; unoccupied by any better tenant, and therefore at liberty for such as him; nor merely empty, and so open to the first comer, but σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον—swept and furnished—better fitted in all respects for his inhabitation than before: that is, the man, for whom all this had been previously done, had not been rendered better, and therefore was necessarily become worse.

Fifthly, upon this discovery, which was more than *he* could have expected who did not know whether he should again procure admission for himself; not content to enter in alone and to dwell there singly, he goes and invites seven others, worse than himself; and they all enter in, and dwell there in conjunction ever after; that is, he is more indissolubly united to his former habitation than before: the soul of the recipient, in

league with *seven* spirits, more wicked than the first; is seven times as wicked as before. Hence on every principle, the last state or the last things of that man become worse than the first: all which St. Matthew has applied, in the words which conclude his account, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ, to the men of that generation, to the Jews of our Saviour's time in particular.

Now St. Peter^s, by quoting the same declaration, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων—has shewn that it may refer to the case of those who, having once believed in Christianity, have subsequently apostatized from it; and, by parity of consequence, to the case of such as, having been once convinced, or had the means of conviction in their power, have afterwards renounced their conviction, or have never used those means aright. This was the case of the Jews in our Saviour's time. The spirit of infidelity, which he had hitherto been combating and still should continue to combat, by every means of proof to be expected from him, was so far ousted and dispossessed. But if the national incredulity should remain unsubdued to the last, when those means of proof would cease to be furnished, the spirit, which was kept in check only by their presence, would be free to return with sevenfold vigour; would take sevenfold as firm possession of the national mind; and consequently become entitled to sevenfold as great a punishment, as before.

Throughout this representation, in every declaration except the last, So shall it be unto this evil generation also, St. Luke accompanies St. Matthew; and this one exception is a point of difference which makes a great change in the character of all that precedes. For with that declaration the whole is converted into a

prophecy, and a fearful prophecy too—levelled against that generation in particular; without it, it becomes merely a continuance of the same general argument, concerning the right use of means and opportunities, with no more of a personal application than the rest. It is not therefore part of a penal denunciation, like the whole of the matter in St. Matthew, but a friendly warning and a serious admonition, in character with every thing else in St. Luke.

To proceed then to the remainder of the two discourses, or what they contain in common, after the omissions in each have been respectively taken into account. The agreement between them is not so complete, as ought to be exhibited in two narratives confessedly the same; nor the disagreement greater than might be produced by the repetition of the same sentiments by the same speaker on a later, which he had already delivered on a former occasion. I have instanced one example of this in the difference of the terms *πνεῦμα* and *δάκτυλος*; and I might instance another in the omission of *σχολάζοντα* by St. Luke, though expressed by St. Matthew; which yet is so important to the order of consequences, that, even though not present in St. Luke, it must still be understood. We might instance also in the similar omission of *μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ*; which is even more important than that of *σχολάζοντα*, and besides being implied in the *ἕτερα*, would be just as necessarily to be understood.

But not to dwell on verbal discrepancies, which may be pointed out in almost every verse of the two accounts, let 17 of St. Luke be compared with 25 of St. Matthew—and 21, 22 of St. Luke with 29 of St. Matthew—and 29, 30 of St. Luke with 39, 40 of St. Matthew—and lastly, 31, 32 of St. Luke with 41, 42 of St. Matthew—and there will appear to be reasonable

cause for doubting how each can possibly be the record of one and the same discourse.

In the last case referred to, the order of the examples in St. Matthew, as it must be evident, is the natural order, because it is that suggested by the principle of association itself. The mention of Jonas as a sign to the Ninevites, and a type of the resurrection, which was to be a sign *κατ' ἐξοχήν* to the men of that generation, led at once to the contrast between the known, historical effect of the former sign upon the Ninevites, and the equally known, though future effect of the latter, or of our Saviour's miracles in general, upon the men of that generation. If however St. Matthew's order was the *natural* order, St. Luke's, which differs from St. Matthew's, we may infer was the *actual* order, and the two accounts must have been distinct. Our Saviour on one occasion cited these examples in the order exhibited by St. Matthew; and on another in the order retained by St. Luke. For there is no more reason why St. Matthew should have altered the *actual* order, for the sake of the *natural*, than why St. Luke should; and still less reason is there, why St. Luke should have altered the *natural* and the *actual* both, for one which was neither.

VI. The circumstances which followed on the discourse in each. St. Luke relates one fact, the exclamation of the woman, which St. Matthew omits; and St. Matthew relates another, in which he is supported by St. Mark, the visit of our Lord's relations, which St. Luke omits. But St. Luke records *his* fact between the answer to the charge and that to the demand; St. Matthew records *his* after both: and from the arrangement of these answers in St. Matthew, no fact, like that in St. Luke, could possibly have intervened in his account; nor, from their ar-

rangement in St. Luke, and from the other circumstances specified by him, could any such fact as that in St. Matthew, have followed upon his account. That he was not ignorant of the fact appears from this; viz. that he relates a similar fact ^t, which happened on the same day with St. Matthew's; and yet was not the same with it, but a second attempt, as we saw elsewhere, on the part of our Lord's relations, to accomplish in the evening what they had not been able to effect in the morning.

There are other objections which might still be urged in disproof of the hypothesis that any part of this transaction in St. Luke can be the same with any part of the transaction in St. Matthew; which yet, for brevity's sake, I shall state only in general.

For instance, if the accounts are the same, then Matt. xii. 22, to the end of the chapter, was comprehended between some hour in the morning and the time of noon, when, according to St. Luke, after the previous discourse the Pharisee invited our Lord to dine. At the end of this dinner, which, as it was, took up more time than usual, Jesus must have delivered the whole of Luke xii. a very long chapter, abounding in interruptions and a frequent change of topics. When this discourse, too, was over, there would still be some interval necessary for Luke xiii. 1-9, or the account relating to the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices; and for the reflections which it drew from our Lord.

All this must have been interposed between Matt. xii. 50 and xiii. 1, at which point of time he is first made to proceed to the lake; and, we may ask, from whence? not certainly from his own house, or that where he was at Matt. xii. 22, when the demoniac was dispossessed; for, according to St. Luke, xi. 37, he

^t Ch. viii. 19.

must have quitted that house when he went to the Pharisee's to dine: and yet that is the house, from which Matt. xiii. 1. evidently supposes him to proceed to the lake, and whither Matt. xiii. 36. makes him return *from* the lake. On the shore of the lake he must have delivered a number of parables, sufficient to occupy a day's teaching; and then have returned to Capernaum, and shut himself up with his disciples, and interpreted his parables to them in private, as well as conversed with them on other topics; all before the time of evening or sunset, when St. Mark shews that he came out of the house again ^u, and gave commandment to cross the lake. It is impossible that so many distinct events should have followed each other and in this order, all within so disproportionate a time.

I shall conclude therefore with observing that the above discussion enables us to determine, by way of corollary, the probable answer to the celebrated question, What was the sin against the Holy Ghost? The offence, committed on the former of these occasions, was *that* sin against the Holy-Ghost. The sin against the Holy Ghost was consequently committed *there* and *then*, and *by those persons*, *when* and *where*, and *by whom*, that charge was insinuated against our Saviour's miracles. But it is no where called the *sin* against the Holy Ghost; it is designated by no name except that of the *blasphemy* against the Holy Ghost: and this distinction is of manifold importance.

For first, the strain of our Lord's denunciations against both the offence, and its authors, is a sufficient proof that whatever it was, it was a sin of *words*; whatever was the guilt of its authors, they had contracted this guilt by an offence in words. Ὁς ἀν εἶπη λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ὃς ὃ' ἀν εἶπη (λό-

^u Ch. iv. 35.

γον) κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου . . . γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν, πονηροὶ ὄντες; ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ—ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας ἐκβάλλει τὰ ἀγαθὰ (ρήματα) καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργόν, ὃ εἰάν λαλήσωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως· ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ.

Secondly, the very essence of blasphemy is to be a sin of words. If any one will take the trouble to peruse the earlier, or what is more to the purpose the contemporary Greek writers, he will soon be satisfied that the term, which expresses the sin of blasphemy, has but one original and proper meaning, and but one common and ordinary acceptation. In the sense of evil or injurious speaking—of slander, traduction, calumny, or the like—it is precisely ἀντίστοιχον to εὐλογία, ἔπαινος, εὐφημία, or to any similar term^v.

It is consequently in a derivative or secondary sense, that it comes to denote what divines, or moralists, understand by the offence of blasphemy as such. It is not impossible for the Supreme Being himself to be made the object of injurious aspersion; that is, of obloquy: and in that case, what would be simply *evil-speaking*, as levelled against a man, becomes *blasphemy*, because directed against God. Nor can it be denied that they who, according to St. Mark, had called the Spirit, by which our Saviour was inspired, ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα—and had confounded the pure and holy Spirit of God with the impure and malignant spirit of Beelzebub, had spoken *evil* of that Spirit—had traduced

^v Compare Matt. xv. 19. xxvii. 39. Mark vii. 22. xv. 29. Luke xxii. 65. xxiii. 39. Acts vi. 11. 13. xiii. 45. xviii. 6. xxvi. 11. Rom. ii. 24. iii. 8. xiv. 16. 1 Cor. iv. 13. x. 30. 1 Tim. i. 13. vi. 1. 4. Tit. iii. 2. Ephes. iv. 31. Col. iii. 8. 1 Pet. iv. 14. 2 Pet. ii. 2. 11. Jude 9, &c.

and maligned that Spirit—in the strictest sense. Hence if that Spirit were really a person and divine, such injurious speaking of that Spirit was strict and proper blasphemy; that is, injurious speaking levelled against God. And who will contend that such blasphemy against the Holy Ghost was not sin against the Holy Ghost? because sin, of which the Holy Ghost himself was directly the object, and from the effects of which, if there was any proper sufferer, that sufferer was the Holy Ghost.

But is the proposition convertible, that all sin, of which the Holy Ghost may be in any manner the object, is such sin as this? All unrighteousness, according to St. John^w, is sin; and all unrighteousness in Christians, who are supposed to be regenerate and under grace, of which the only source is the Holy Ghost, must so far be sin against the Holy Ghost; because it must be sin against grace. But even in this sense, according to the same authority, there is a sin *not unto death* as well as a sin *unto death*; both, such as might be committed by a brother Christian. The sin unto death, which might be so committed, and for which the Apostle gives no encouragement even to pray, might be that sin against the Holy Ghost, which our Lord had pronounced unpardonable both in this world, and in the next. But the sin not unto death, which must include all other sins beside that, could not be the sin against the Holy Ghost in particular; though if committed, as the Apostle supposes, by a fellow Christian, sin against the Holy Ghost in a general sense it must still be.

In the application of human laws to human crimes, it is an acknowledged principle that the terms of

every *penal* statute are to be rigidly and literally construed. The same rule is surely to be taken for our guide in interpreting this one, and this sole instance of God's extreme and severest malediction against some offence, which may, indeed, be really committed, but, if really committed, becomes thenceforward unpardonable; for which neither the intercession of fellow-believers, nor the penitence of the offender—if penitence in such a case be possible—nor, what is more, the efficacy of the Christian atonement, (which, for ought we know to the contrary, extends to every crime besides,) can avail to procure forgiveness.

Now the denunciations ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημία—and ὅς ὃ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον—and, what is equivalent to them both, τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι—occur ῥητῶς^x. But where do we meet with the expressions, ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁμαρτία—or, if that is not sufficiently correct for the meaning, with ἡ δὲ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἁμαρτία, or, τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἁμαρτύνει; And yet, on this distinction between sin against the Holy Ghost in general, and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or one such sin in particular, the whole question, what was the offence now committed, and by whom, must be acknowledged to depend.

It has always appeared to me so irrelevant to the present occasion; so irreconcilable with the context; so inconsistent with the known laws of the association of ideas; so destructive of the necessary connection between desert and punishment, or cause and effect: to suppose the malediction pronounced *now*, and the crime on which it is pronounced, committed *hereafter*; to see the Scribes and the Pharisees addressed in terms

^x Matt. xii. 31. Mark iii. 29. Luke xii. 10.

of the most indignant personal rebuke, and yet to have given no personal offence; to believe that our Saviour was resenting, as just committed, a crime which could not take place until almost two years afterwards; that I should venture to dismiss, as unworthy of serious notice, the opinion which understands the blasphemy proleptically of the scoffers on the day of Pentecost, who ridiculed the Apostles as full of new wine.

It is more necessary to observe that even the phrase τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which stands absolutely in this passage, must yet be construed with the ellipsis of τῆς γένεως ταύτης; an ellipsis, which Matt. x. 17. 32, 33, and other instances, capable of being produced, shew to be nothing extraordinary. In this case, the specific reference both of the crime, and of its denunciation, to the persons then present, becomes so much the more demonstrable. We may conceive too why upon this principle the blasphemy against our Lord in particular, considered as the Son of man—in which light only his enemies could have presumed to traduce him at all—might be pardonable; but not, on the same account, the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. The former might be pardonable on the same score that every other injury, already inflicted, or still to be inflicted on our Lord in his human capacity might be pardonable. For it was a part of his humiliation to hear himself reviled, and not to revile again; nor consequently to resent the reviling; to endure the gainsaying and obloquy of sinners patiently; and to be set, in short, as holy Symeon had long before predicted of him, εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον ^γ. But no such reason could apply to extenuate the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; especially, if that blasphemy was deliberately com-

mitted. For such an outrage upon the majesty and the holiness of God, to serve the most malignant purposes, and not more repugnant to truth, and derogatory to the Deity, than at variance with the common sense of mankind, no excuse could be assigned at all; and, therefore, as being inexcusable, it might justly be pronounced unpardonable.

END OF VOL. II.





5530

Bib.Lit

Author Greswell, Edward

G

Title Dissertations upon the principles and arrangement of
an harmony of the Gospels. Vol.2.

**University of Toronto
Library**

**DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET**

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

